

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS



For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE PUBLIC IMAGE
OF THE INTELLECTUAL:
PERCEPTIONS OF A
SOCIAL TYPE

by



PONDO WOOD

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

September, 1968



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2020 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/RWood1968>

1968 (F)
243

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "The Public Image of the Intellectual: Perceptions of a Social Type", submitted by Rondo Wood in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

ABSTRACT

"The Public Image of the Intellectual: Perceptions of a Social Type" is a report on an exploratory project which tests the argument that people living in different social worlds have different cognitive images of social types. The data on 'the intellectual' was collected in Edmonton, Alberta during 1964-65 from seventy respondents sampled from a high status area (The Heights), and a lower status area (The Flats).

These respondents were chosen to give the 'out-group's' view of 'the intellectual', and a control group of seventeen selected university professors provided a comparative 'in-group' point of view.

Analysis of data involved cross-tabulations of variables, particularly using a Social Class Score as the independent variable. The findings show that social class differences do exist in the perception of 'the intellectual', that people from disparate social worlds do view men of ideas differently. In part, analysis controlled for quality of media exposure, with social class and intellectual variables dichotomized. On cognitive variables such as the general characteristics of intellectuals and their perceived fields of employment and goals, indices of social class were determinant more strongly than were indices of quality of media consumed. On attitude items, media quality was more important.

The intellectual was perceived by high class respondents to be an introverted bookworm, highly educated whether formally or on his own, an academic, scientific, artistic or professional man, working for the societal good as well as to satisfy his curiosity. To low class subjects, the intellectual was more often an extrovert giving advice to people in trouble, university educated, someone in the helping professions, a scientist or academic, working officially for the societal good but also

for his own status, to some extent a 'bigshot'.

The most characteristic pattern of attitudes found was ambivalence, and the level of anti-intellectualism was neither extensive, nor well-measured by the questions asked. Edmontonians are polite if somewhat distrustful of the so-called intellectual.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to thank the Department of Sociology at The University of Alberta for providing the facilities for preparation of the instrument and the program, for their staff members' advice, and for their office space during revisions of the thesis. Acknowledgments are also due to the Department of Educational Administration of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education for their computer time, to their faculty for encouragement and advice, particularly to Dr. Emil J. Haller who lost his assistant while the project took her attention.

Special thanks are due to the members of the Committee, particularly Dr. Charles Hobart, who was a patient and understanding Chairman; Dr. Donald Larsen and Dr. Sally Snyder, for their diligent and rapid reading of the final draft. The author is very grateful to Dr. J.T. Borhek, without whose encouragement the project would not have been undertaken, and to Dr. Warren Kalbach who also stimulated the early stages.

Acknowledgments are made to all the judges, the sample of respondents from Edmonton and of professors from The University of Alberta, for their contribution to the data of the project.

Finally, thanks go to the fellow students in Edmonton and Toronto for their help in pretesting, to those who acted as interviewers, to the typists who handled small sections of the draft. Special commendation is deserved by Mrs. Felicity Burns, whose typing of the entire draft was the efficient calm in the final hurricane.

To the memory of Dr. Stanley Taylor, this thesis is respectfully dedicated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Introduction	1
	The Problem.	2
	Definitions of Concepts.	2
	The Local Situation.	11
	Summary and Plan of the Thesis	14
	Footnotes.	16
II	A REVIEW OF THE THEORETICAL LITERATURE	19
	The Problem.	19
	The Research Questions	21
	Question One	22
	Question Two	32
	Question Three	39
	Question Four.	45
	Question Five.	56
	Summary.	60
	Footnotes.	62
III	METHODOLOGY I: DATA COLLECTION.	72
	Introduction	72
	Locale: The Flats and The Heights	73
	Sampling	76
	Procedures: The Interview Schedule.	78
	Analysis of Data	81
	Checks and Controls.	85

	Summary.	87
	Footnotes.	88
IV	METHODOLOGY II: ITEMS AND SCORES.	91
	Indices of Independent Variables	92
	Social Class Score	92
	Indices of Dependent Variables	99
	Mass Media Exposure.	100
	Media Quality: The Panel of Judges :	104
	Media Quality: Scoring	106
	Anti-Intellectualism Score	122
	Conservatism Score	124
	Summary.	125
	Footnotes.	127
V	ANALYSIS: THE IMAGE OF THE INTELLECTUAL	134
	Characteristics of Intellectuals	135
	Academic Sub-group's Definition.	144
	Perceived Social Position.	146
	The Goals and Values of Intellectuals.	151
	Attitudes toward Intellectuals	157
	Summary.	172
	Footnotes.	174
VI	ANALYSIS: THE IMAGE MAKERS.	178
	Independence of Samples by Social World.	179
	Research Question One.	182
	Research Question Two.	192
	Research Question Three.	205

Research Question Four	213
Research Question Five	224
Attitude Variables, Class and Media.	238
Academics and Perceived Public Attitudes	245
Summary.	248
Footnotes.	250
VII CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	253
Introduction	253
The Findings	254
Implications	259
Suggestions for Future Research.	264
Footnotes.	267
BIBLIOGRAPHY	268
APPENDIX I : CENSUS DATA ON EDMONTON AREAS	276
APPENDIX II : INTERVIEW SCHEDULE.	281
APPENDIX III: INSTRUCTIONS FOR CULTURE JUDGES	288
APPENDIX IV : TABLES FOR CHAPTER IV	291

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
VI - 1 Distribution of Scores by Mann-Whitney U-Test	180
VI - 2 Distribution of Scores by Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance with Panks	180
VI - 3 Characteristics of Intellectuals by Social Class Score	184
VI - 4 Characteristics of Intellectuals by Years of Education of Respondent	184
VI - 5 Traits of Typical Intellectual by Social Class Score. .	187
VI - 6 "Specialness" of Intellectual by Area of Residence. . .	190
VI - 7 "Specialness" of Intellectual by Years of Education of Respondent.	190
VI - 8 Perceived Employment of Intellectuals by Social Class Score	194
VI - 9 Cumulative Choices from List of Careers of Intellectuals by Social Class Score	194
VI - 10 Perceived Employment of Intellectuals by Occupations of Working Males	199
VI - 11 Cumulative Choices from List of Careers of Intellectuals by Occupations of Working Males	202
VI - 12 Schooling Needed for Intellectualism by Years of Educa- tion of Respondent.	202
VI - 13 Perceived Goals of Intellectuals by Social Class Score	207
VI - 14 Perceived Goals of Intellectuals by Years of Education of Respondent	207
VI - 15 Social Class, Media Exposure and Percent Specific Characteristics	217
VI - 16 Social Class, Media Quality and Percent Specific Characteristics	217
VI - 17 Social Class, Media Quality and Percent All "True" Intellectuals Respected	219

VI - 18	Social Class, Media Quality and Percent Specific Employment Perceived.	219
VI - 19	Social Class, Media Quality and Percent Introverts of "Typical Intellectual"	222
VI - 20	Social Class, Media Quality and Percent Societal Goals Perceived	222
VI - 21	Respect for Intellectuals by Social Class Score	225
VI - 22	Attitude to Criticism Function of Intellectuals by Social Class Score.	225
VI - 23	Restrictions on Teachers' Freedom by Social Class Score	231
VI - 24	Restrictions on Teachers' Freedom by Area of Residence	231
VI - 25	Social Class Score and Perceived Loneliness of Intellectuals	235
VI - 26	Respondents Subscribing to Various Views of Intellectuals	235
VI - 27	Social Class, Media Quality and Percent Restrict Teachers.	239
VI - 28	Social Class, Media Quality and Percent Many Negative Adjectives.	239
VI - 29	Social Class, Media Quality and Percent Qualified Approval of Criticism	241
VI - 30	Social Class, Media Quality and Percent Disapproval of Criticism	241

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"Some of the statements made by cabinet ministers have been such that I fear censorship of books is what some people want', Dr. Henry Kreisel head of the U of A's English department said today. (Two cabinet ministers) attacked 'teachers who appeared to be allowing trash literature to creep into the schools'. Said Dr. Kreisel: 'the charges in general have been wild and vague, with such highly-loaded words as trash and filth tossed around. It smacks of a general attack being launched on intellectuals in Alberta.'"

-- "Professor Fears Book Censorship"
The Edmonton Journal, December 3, 1964

Intellectual pervers are as commonplace as moral pervers and even more dangerous. . . . When (Paul) stood in the center of the intellectual world of his day, he cried out three things as its characteristics, idolatry, superstition, and ignorance of the worst kind.

-- E.C. Manning, "Back to the Bible Hour"
Radio station CFRN, December 6, 1964

To a large extent, we are ruled by mediocrities. And for that, the intellectuals have no one to blame but themselves.

-- Editorial, "Brainpower and Politics"
The Edmonton Journal, May 8, 1964

The first question asked by people who learn of this project is "What is an intellectual?" My initial task in such conversations, and in this chapter, is to impress the person that this was my own question. The research of this project was designed to find out what an intellectual is to various citizens; it was not intended to espouse any particular definition, take that to citizens, and test their agreement or familiarity with a given definition. The study was designed to elicit the definitions and attitudes held by citizens toward the so-called intellectual.

If the reader is wondering what the referent should be for 'an intellectual' in approaching this thesis, he should ask himself what is his own image: what the label an intellectual brings first to his own mind. It is hoped that the comparison between his own concept and the imagery, traced by the authors and respondents quoted herein, will be enjoyable.

The Problem

The project is an exploratory study of the public definition of the social type 'the intellectual'. The meaning of intellectual, and the perceived characteristics of persons so labelled were investigated among a sample of residents of the city of Edmonton, Alberta, in the winter of 1964-65. The study is a test of the sociology of knowledge, attempting to show that different groups in different social worlds display different conceptions of the so-called intellectual.

This introductory chapter will discuss the definitional problems involved in the use of concepts like 'image', 'social type', 'social world' and 'intellectual'. Each of these will be dealt with in terms of their usage in this project. We will also trace the local conditions alluded to in the quotations beginning the chapter, and the applicability of the study at that time. The chapter concludes with a brief outline of the chapters to follow.

Definitions of Concepts

In order to approach the study with the appropriate frame of reference, we shall discuss the essential concepts, listed above, which are basic to the vocabulary of the thesis. First, the word 'image', which will connote the conception of the so-called intellectual that was obtained from respondents.

An 'image', to Kenneth Boulding, and other writers on the

subject is an idealized concept which could be referred to as a stereotype, or a category with changing content.¹ When we consider the image of the intellectual, we refer to a mixture of both the label and its content. A tradition of meanings is communicated over time, which Boulding calls a 'transcript', and this is connoted to knowledgeable people if they hear the category mentioned.²

Any image is idealized, it has normative elements which may or may not relate to actual behaviors, because it is a short-hand conception, generalized from reality. When we shall discuss the concept of 'social type' this discussion can be placed in appropriate context. Here, it is enough to say that the original definition of 'stereotype' by Walter Lippmann helps to explain images as: "pictures in our heads".³ Any verbal label, such as 'apple', brings into mind a physical category and a content-meaning about the entity labelled. So, although the referent for apple may change with the society, its eating habits, its climate and the growth of apples on its soil or their importation, each citizen socialized to the full vocabulary has a mental image of an apple.

The image means that the person holding it has, however vague, an idealized concept which has come from what Durkheim would call the 'collective representations' of the society.⁴ That is, a set of possible physical descriptions, a series of characteristic traits, connected with a set of normative elements and possible expectations of either roles of animate objects, or effects of inanimate ones. Thinking of an apple, we should be most surprised if, biting into it, it tasted like a lemon. Our image includes a memory of its sweet, tart taste.

Similarly, one of the basic assumptions of this project is that well-socialized citizens will have an image of 'an intellectual' when they hear that label, and that it will relate more to the 'man of knowledge' connotations, than to other different labels, such as 'rioter' or 'door-to-door salesman'. The concept 'social type' adds greatly to this understanding.

'Social types' are particular social representations which cartoon the traits of well-known societal role-types or personality-types: 'teeny-bopper', 'good-time-Charlie'. Much of the work on social typing owes its conceptual frame to Samuel Strong, who did a war-time study of Chicago ghetto labels and social types in the Negro minority group.⁵ We utilize the category for 'the intellectual', who meets the requirements for a social type, in that the label is a common sense categorization of a practical case--there are people whose way of life, favorite pursuits, manner of speaking, all make the 'social type' of 'an intellectual' seem logical.

Orrin Klapp's book, Heroes, Villains and Fools pictures American society as a land of name-calling and typing, in order that the characteristics and appropriate roles be widely communicated. There is a social control function, in Klapp's opinion, in social typing.⁶ If our respondents are familiar with the social type 'the intellectual', will they then be more aware of ideas and the value placed upon them by our society? The collective representation of the group should not only include descriptive traits accorded the 'intellectual' but also role prescriptions and attitudes, positive and negative.

The issue of familiarity or non-familiarity with the intellectual requires the introduction of the concept 'social world'. An

unpublished paper by Anselm Strauss is quoted saying:

. . .when an individual's vocabularies are limited in range, his knowledge of alternative paths of action is limited.⁷

There are certainly sub-cultures and sub-groups within the society where we could imagine that the word 'intellectual' is completely unknown. Until empirical research is undertaken on labelling and social typing in Canada, the delineations of such groups will not be known. But certainly each person in English-speaking Canada expresses categories of thought which are appropriate to the English vocabulary with which he was socialized. If he grew up in the muskegs of north-western Ontario, he might never have heard of 'door-to-door salesmen'. They would not be part of his social world, and quite unfamiliar to him. If his categories of thought, his images, and his own labels did not include 'door-to-door salesmen' he could not be expected to have positive or negative attitudes to them either.

Tamotsu Shibutani portrays the concept 'social world' as arising out of the differing perspectives and ranges of contacts that citizens in a complex society experience.⁸ We asked citizens from different socio-economic areas of Edmonton a series of open-ended questions about the characteristics of so-called intellectuals. The following quotation provides a major argument for the sampling procedure and the questioning procedure that was used to find out the image of the intellectual:

Communication channels are now readily accessible, even to those who are illiterate. Since these networks no longer coincide with territorial boundaries, culture areas overlap and have lost their ecological foundations. Next-door neighbors may be complete strangers. Even in common parlance there is an intuitive recognition of this diversity of perspectives, and we speak meaningfully of people living in different social worlds--the world of high finance, the academic world, the world of children, or the world of the theater. . . .

Variations in outlook arise through differential contact and association; the maintenance of social distance--through segregation, conflict, or simply reading different literature--leads to the formation of distinctive cultures. Thus, people in different social classes develop dissimilar modes of life not because of anything inherent in economic position but because similarity of occupations and the limitations set by income level dispose them to certain restricted communication channels.⁹

In the present study, 'social world' is conceived to embrace not only social class differences between the two sampled areas of the city, but also cultural interest-differences. The low-status area is not only populated by working-class families, but there is a factory at its boundary whose whistle for shift-changes sets a pace for life in the area. These citizens patronize the beer parlor, the bowling alley, and the men work over the engines of their cars in yards strewn with car-parts.

The high status area represents another social world, its professional and managerial-status families live in sumptuous new homes, overlooking the city. Winter sports like curling bonspiels and ski weekends draw them outside of their homes, where they enjoy cocktails before dinner and bridge afterwards.

If we find that the two disparate social area samples also conceptualize the social type 'the intellectual' with rather different images, the study will have indicated that people whose social worlds are discrete can be expected to have different categories of thought. We argue that the social experience of upper-middle-class professionals, affluent and highly educated, will give them a different perception of so-called intellectuals than the social world of lower-class working people, public-school-educated and living in economic struggle.

The subsequent chapters will describe the procedures used to indicate differences in social class, in media exposure and media quality, which will enable us to pinpoint social world differences, when looking at their imagery about the so-called intellectual. We will be able to show that the differences in vocabularies of socially distinct respondents are associated with varied connotations of 'intellectual'. Lest this be interpreted as simply linguistic differences, and vocabulary differences--we re-emphasize that the postulate of the thesis is that different social types are relevant to people whose social worlds are discrete. It is assumed that 'intellectual' will be a usable referent for all respondents, even those who would use 'brain' in their speech.

The concept 'intellectual' will be discussed here so as to have understanding of the varied historical meanings against which any citizen's image can be categorized. At the outset, the two currently seminal works on this social type should be mentioned: Richard Hofstadter's Anti-Intellectualism in American Life, and Lewis A. Coser's Men of Ideas.¹⁰ Both are historical in treatment of the phenomenon of intellectual life, and attitudes of intellectuals about other citizens and of non-intellectual attitudes toward men of ideas. Neither book is empirically-based research into the view of the intellectual, both represent the lengthy genre of intellectual self-examination which sprang from Julian Benda's famous Traison des Clercs (The Great Betrayal in English), "which has been highlighted by such publications as Florian Znaniecki's The Social Role of the Man of Knowledge,¹² and Merle Curti's "Intellectuals and Other People".¹³

Even in naming books and articles, several synonyms for 'the

intellectual' have been mentioned: men of ideas, and man of knowledge are probably the easiest shorthand definitions which are available. As is connoted there, intellectuals are people for whom ideas and the pursuit of knowledge are the very essence of life. As Hofstadter put it, "he brings to his profession a distinctive feeling about ideas which is not required by his job."¹⁴ The feeling embraces two qualities of playfulness and piety toward ideas--and "in some sense he lives for ideas".¹⁵ Whereas it may have been easy a century ago to point to the intellectual occupations of philosophy, writing, criticism, the priesthood, and consider the occupants all to be intellectuals, current historians are careful to eliminate the intelligent and the mental workers as automatic intellectuals.

There is now a considerable body of knowledge available about the intellectual, his traits, problems and social roles. Whereas most of the material about the intellectual is published in academic quarterlies and 'little magazines', articles about intellectuals have recently appeared in such mass-circulation magazines as Time, Commentary, New York Times Magazine,¹⁶ and Hofstadter's book is famous as a Pulitzer Prize-winner. Familiarity with the label 'intellectual' is less difficult to assume in the general population. Not only are serious papers dealing with the characteristics of so-called intellectuals, but many persons who utilize the mass media are frequently making reference to the label and the social type. The societal definition of intellectualism has not until now been empirically researched. If there are a variety of images connoted when the label 'an intellectual' is used, implying that the social typing process is taking place, then it is of sociological interest to study the imagery. What does 'an intellec-

tual' mean to various groups and social worlds in contemporary Canada?

Except for the scholarly literature on the history of so-called men of knowledge--overwhelmingly American if the writing is recent--we have many more questions about the image of the intellectual than we have answers. A small scale exploratory study, such as this, cannot, of course, be definitive, but an attempt will be made to find out what are the initial connotations, the perceived occupational roles, goals and personality characteristics attributed to people to whom respondents would apply the label intellectuals.

In order to indicate the amount and intensity of negative feelings associated with the intellectual social type, called anti-intellectualism, we have asked a number of questions which are designed to tap attitudes held about various facets of intellectual life. The major work on anti-intellectualism is Hofstadter's book, which claims that ambivalent feelings about men of knowledge are pervasive in American life, and basic to the British heritage of the United States.¹⁷ By inference, then, a Canadian study should investigate attitudes which are purported to be "notably strong in Anglo-Saxon experience."¹⁸ Hofstadter cautions, however, that:

. . . (anti-intellectualism) does not yield very readily to definition. As an idea, it is not a single proposition, but a complex of related propositions. As an attitude, it is not usually found in a pure form but in ambivalence--a pure and unalloyed dislike of intellect or intellectuals is uncommon. It seems clear that those who have some quarrel with intellect are almost always ambivalent about it--they mix respect and awe with suspicion and resentment; and this has been true in many societies and phases of human history.¹⁹

Precisely the same thing could be said of the concept 'intellectual'--it connotes a complex of traits and a mixture of roles,

and attitudes range from clear awe and idealization to distrust and indifference. An intellectual is more than someone who earns his living off ideas, for mental workers may not be interested in the pursuit of knowledge for pleasure. He is more than intelligent, he has intellect, "the critical, creative, and contemplative side of mind", and there may be a range of intelligence--that which "seeks to grasp, manipulate, re-order, adjust,"²⁰ among admittedly intellectual people. In little of the literature incidentally, are women considered to be intellectuals, which Leo Gurko vehemently decried in his Heroes, Highbrows and the Popular Mind:

The female intellectual, whether she be a schoolteacher, doctor, lawyer, or magazine editor, is thought to be in serious danger of losing her femininity. The old regressive belief that women's place is in the home, where thinking is the least of her activities, underlies this attitude. In each instance the professional woman is supposed to pay a heavy emotional price for her career. .²¹

The pursuit of knowledge for its own pleasure, and the maleness of the so-called intellectual (not particular masculinity however²²) are almost the only uniform components of the definition of intellectual. Sociologists who have discussed the social type have focussed on 'the social role of the man of knowledge', and Znaniecki specified the varieties of secular scholars as: the discoverer of truth, the systematizer, the contributor, the fighter for truth, the eclectic and the historian of knowledge, the disseminator of knowledge, the discoverer of facts and the discoverer of problems.²³ S.M. Lipset compressed and brought this long list to current occupational functions, still concentrating on social role:

I have considered as intellectuals all those who create, distribute, and apply culture, that is, the symbolic world of man, including art, science, and religion. Within this group there are two main levels: the hard core or creators of culture--scholars, artists, philosophers, authors, some editors, and some journalists; and the distributors--performers in the various arts, most teachers, most reporters. A peripheral group is composed of those who apply culture as part of their jobs--professionals like physicians and lawyers.²⁴

Znaniecki's abstract conceptualization of men of ideas in relation to knowledge, and Lipset's concrete connotation of them in relation to work roles, exemplify the sociological views of the intellectual. Merton, Porter and Coser examine the man of ideas in relation to institutions and bureaucracies with which he affiliates or from which he tries to remain autonomous.²⁵ Edward Shils has elaborated the traditions which so-called intellectuals have espoused, including scientism, the populist and romantic traditions, in his conception.²⁶

The ideological frames of reference of respondents' conceptions of the so-called intellectual cannot be as readily known to us as those of some of the writers about intellectuals. For instance, the view of the intellectual of a C. Wright Mills is very different from that of a Karl Mannheim,²⁷ and these different ideologies are obtainable from knowing the authors' total works. It is highly probable that respondents represent vastly different points of view, which can only be alluded to in a study of this nature.

The Local Situation

The climate of opinion in Edmonton at the time of the study resembled a 'city versus campus' factioning. Tension was evident from the fall of 1963, when four high-minded university faculty members accused the then-mayor of corruption and near-riots occurred, to the

late 1964 furor over the dismissal of a district high-school teacher for allegedly 'ridiculing Christianity', to comments in the local paper in July 1965 regarding the professors' right to make political statements: "Who Broke the Eggheads' Shell? You, the Public, Did-- So stop trying to force them back into it--contends Professor".²⁸ Edmonton was particularly appropriate for a study on the public image of the intellectual, for as the quotations at the beginning of the chapter illustrate, the word 'intellectual' was being bandied about freely by many citizens who used the mass media.

Edmonton turned its attention to the academic community with newly opened eyes after the public protest by four university faculty members²⁹ of the induction of the new mayor on the grounds that he was not morally fit for public office because he had abused public trust.³⁰ Students and citizens clashed in subsequent weeks in front of the City Hall, and the entire populace took sides, for or against the protests of what was considered to be the entire university community concerning the office-taking of the duly elected mayor. The four staff members found threatening letters in the mail for nearly a full year afterwards, and university-civic relations were strained for some time.³¹

The next episode occurred in the late fall of 1964, during the time of data collection for this project. A teacher was suspended from a district High School for asking his class to state their religious beliefs, as he stated his own agnosticism, and for lending a student a locally-produced avant garde journal. The suspension took effect despite a vigorous defence by Alberta Teacher's Association agents, student support, the Minister of Education's intervention--largely because of the parental outcries that a person acting as teacher and guidance

counsellor should not jeopardize the "moral well-being of the pupils".³² The teacher withstood what pressure he could, but resigned with bitter publicity early in the New Year. The university faculty had circulated a petition protesting "A growing atmosphere of restricted freedom in Alberta" calling for re-affirmation of key principles related to the freedom of enquiry, of teaching and criticism of teachers by students; that religious or political views should not be criteria for hiring or firing teachers; that the ultimate goal of education is to equip the individual to make his own evaluations.³³ The petition had been signed by 148 faculty members, 65% of them senior faculty, representing all departments, by the time of its newspaper publication in mid-December, 1964. The premier was asked for a bill legislating anti-discrimination regulations, not only for speech, but also for protection of rights of employment, housing and public accommodations. However, the government suggested that such legislation might be unnecessary and detrimental, which brought another rash of letters to the newspaper from academics.³⁴

By mid-summer of 1965, the protests of professors over the American intervention in Viet Nam were almost the only vestiges of ferment. According to one professor, an attitude of anti-intellectualism was basic to the protests of citizens against the criticism made by academics on many occasions.³⁵ There is no doubt that this concern on the part of citizens over the activities and statements of professors, teachers, and other types of intellectuals promoted interest in the interview among respondents in this study. The enhanced enthusiasm in the latter section of the interview, due to the campus-city conflicts of that year, produced timely responses.

Summary and Plan of the Thesis

The goal of this project is to illuminate the public's image of the social type 'the intellectual', by examining the different conceptions presumed to be held by citizens of Edmonton who live in discrete socio-economic areas. The thesis is a test of a fundamental tenant of the sociology of knowledge, that persons whose social worlds are different have different cognitive structures and hence, different images of such types as 'intellectuals'. We have introduced such concepts basic to the research as image, social type, social world, intellectual. The study was conducted in Edmonton at a time when the climate of opinion in the city demarcated the university as a segment of the intellectual community whose views were considered to be opposed to those of the non-campus community. It is of particular interest to have studied the cognitive and attitudinal attributes held toward the so-called intellectual during that time.

Chapter II will cite relevant literature on images of scientists and related sub-types of intellectuals. Research methodologies are discussed in Chapters III and IV: sampling in III, and scores in IV. Analysis of the data is also treated in two chapters: Chapter V presents the content analysis of the imagery found to apply to intellectuals. Chapter VI discusses the image-makers, and relates the tabulation of respondents with various scores and indicators of social world. There we will see if the postulate that imagery will differ with different respondent-types has been substantiated. The concluding section, Chapter VII, will discuss the generalizations which are possible from this exploratory study, and the implications for further research. Supportive material has been relegated to the appendices

at the end of the thesis: Appendix I contains the Census data on Edmonton, Appendix II contains the Interview Schedule, in Appendix III are the instructions given to the judges of Culture Items, and in Appendix IV are the tables illustrating item-to-score 'fit' of each of the scores utilized.

FOOTNOTES CHAPTER I

1. Kenneth E. Boulding, The Image: Knowledge in life and society (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1956).
2. Boulding, ibid., pp. 72-73.
3. Walter Lippmann defined a stereotype in this way in 1922, and is quoted in Gordon Allport, The Nature of Prejudice (Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1954), p. 187.
4. Emile Durkheim, The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life (New York: Collier Books, 1961).
5. Samuel M. Strong, "Social Types in a Minority Group: Formulation of a Method," American Journal of Sociology (after this, AJS) XLVIII (March, 1943), pp. 563-573.
6. Orrin E. Klapp, Heroes, Villains and Fools (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, A Spectrum Book, 1962), pp. 16-24. Cf. note 8 below, for Shibutani speaks more directly to the issue of social control.
7. Anselm Strauss, p. 28 of an unpublished paper quoted by Leon Warshay in "Breadth of Perspective", in Arnold M. Rose, Human Behavior and Social Processes (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1962), pp. 152-154.
8. Tamotsu Shibutani, "Reference Groups and Social Control", in Rose, ibid., pp. 134-137.
9. Shibutani, ibid., pp. 134-135.
10. Richard Hofstadter, Anti-Intellectualism in American Life (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963). Lewis A. Coser, Men of Ideas: A Sociologist's View (New York: The Free Press, 1965).
11. Julian Benda, The Great Betrayal (London: Routledge, 1928). Richard Aldridge translated it from the Paris publication of 1927. Benda emphasized that intellectuals placed ideas as their highest goals, and eschewed status goals.
12. Florian Znaniecki, The Social Role of the Man of Knowledge (New York: Columbia University Press, 1940).
13. Merle Curti, "Intellectuals and Other People", The American Historical Review, LX, 2, (January, 1955), pp. 259-282.
14. Hofstadter, op. cit., p. 27.
15. Ibid.

16. Time Magazine featured a double-page essay entitled "The Flourishing Intellectuals", May 21, 1965. Saturday Review and Harper's both had articles in 1963, and Commentary had four between 1965 and 1966, one entitled "What is an Intellectual?" by R.A. Nisbet, Commentary 40:93-94, December, 1965. Nisbet makes the following illuminating comment about the popularity of the concept of intellectualism in the contemporary press: "As Esquire, The Saturday Evening Post, the New Yorker, Time, and many others have discovered, sophistication and intellectualism are good business." (p. 101). Lewis S. Feuer's "The Elite of the Alienated" in The New York Times Magazine, March 26, 1967, begins in a vein common to most of the mass market articles on the topic: "Never before in the history of the United States has the intellectual been so much in the forefront of things. ."
17. Hofstadter, op. cit., p. 20.
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid., pp. 7, 19.
20. Ibid., p. 25.
21. Leo Gurko, Heroes, Highbrows and the Popular Mind, (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, A Charter Book, 1962), p. 60.
22. Gurko traces films, books and magazines, to show that the American intellectual has been negatively stereotyped as impractical and impotent on the one hand, but treacherous and seductive on the other, ibid., pp. 49-62.
23. Znaniecki, op. cit., pp. 150-162.
24. Seymour Martin Lipset, Political Man, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co. Ltd., Anchor Books, 1960), p. 333.
25. Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, Revised and Enlarged Edition, (Glencoe: Free Press, 1957) who devotes a chapter to the problems of intellectuals and bureaucracy; John Porter, The Vertical Mosaic (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), where he discusses the intellectuals in Canada as a "clerisy" affiliated with the establishment; and Lewis A. Coser, op. cit., who stresses the institutional affiliations of intellectuals in America.
26. Edward A. Shils, "The Traditions of Intellectuals", in George B. de Huszar, ed., The Intellectuals, (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1960), pp. 55-61. The other articles in that section of Huszar's book are also relevant.

27. C. Wright Mills was a sociologist of knowledge of the avowedly Marxist ideology, who argued that the barriers between intellectuals and others should be erased for greater co-operation. Karl Mannheim was an elitist, who proposed that the intellectuals should form an interstitial class to supervise social change.
28. Our sources for this section on the use of the concept 'intellectual' in the local mass media include the one daily newspaper, The Edmonton Journal, the university students' twice-weekly newspaper, The Gateway, teletype copy from the Canadian Press wire-service, and transcripts of a radio sermon by the Honorable F.C. Manning on station CFRN. The headline named in the text is from The Edmonton Journal, "Journal for Dissent", July 29, 1965.
29. Three junior level professors and one university staff member attempted to read a petition in the investiture ceremony of the new mayor, in October 1963. Because they were attempting to speak from the public gallery at a meeting of City Council, they were forcibly removed, continuing to read as long as one could pass the document to the other to read aloud.
30. The petition accused the mayor of having breached the public trust of his office by taking part in land deals in the city during his previous term.
31. The Gateway of January 8, 1965 features an article "Letters Threaten Lecturer" which documents the flood of mail which came every time the faculty member involved, "makes a public speech or prints an article." Although few students took part in demonstrations, citizens considered that the entire university was behind the protests.
32. Such was the phrasing of the County of Strathcona in the charge which suspended the teacher on November 11, 1964, referring to Section 350(a) of the School Act, where reasons of "gross misconduct, neglect of duty" etc. are the justifications for dismissal. Even if the Minister felt that the County Board had stretched a point in citing this reason as sufficient cause, the County stood behind its action and requested termination of the teacher's contract. On his voluntary resignation in January, the teacher sent a lengthy explanation of the case to the newspaper, published in The Edmonton Journal, January 28, 1965.
33. Text of the petition on Freedom of Enquiry, reprinted in its entirety as "Professors Protest Freedom Restrictions" The Edmonton Journal, December 11, 1964.
34. Among Letters and Editorials, the "Journal for Dissent" published "How does the Premier Know we Don't Need It?" by a professor of Anthropology.
35. The newspaper had reprinted an American comment on presumptuous professors, which sparked the strongly-worded article defending academic criticism, by an Arts faculty professor, July 29, 1965.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE THEORETICAL LITERATURE

Language, socially built and maintained, embodies implicit exhortations and social evaluations. By acquiring the categories of a language, we acquire the structured 'ways' of a group, and along with the language, the value-implicates of those 'ways'.

-- C. Wright Mills
"Language, Logic and
Culture" in Power,
Politics and People

This chapter will review the empirical and theoretical literature, which is appropriate to a study of 'the intellectual' as a social type. After a statement of the problem under examination, a sociological approach to it will be outlined, and a series of research questions will be posed and discussed in view of pertinent literature. It will be shown that although few researches relate precisely to the public image of the so-called intellectual, there have been studies of the scientist and the professor which do have parallels to the more generalized social type 'the intellectual'.

The Problem

The relationships between categories of thought and social structure have fascinated sociologists from Durkheim to Coser. Agreement exists that group involvements and social position determine values and perspectives, and this postulate underlies the sociology of knowledge. As Mannheim phrased it: "The sociology of knowledge is concerned. . . with the varying ways in which objects present themselves to the subject according to the differences in social settings".¹ The process called social typing derives from collective representation,

to durably label a set of traits considered to characterize a kind of role. Orrin Klapp writes of social types:

The name is the symbol of a class present in our minds as a concept. Social types are not, however, logical categories. Unlike scientific and logical categories, they are based on practical experience, common sense judgment of situations as lived rather than as observed. They result from insight rather than reasoning. . Though simplified, they are by no means necessarily distorted pictures.²

The argument of the thesis, then, is that different descriptions and stated images of the so-called intellectual will characterize persons of different social structural and cultural involvements. If people called intellectuals were uniformly visible to members of all strata of the society, little variation in the image would be anticipated. If men of ideas participated in one clearly defined occupational field, we might expect one image. Since this is the first empirical study known to the researcher to investigate public attitudes and descriptions of 'the intellectual', we do not know if the label connotes Mad Scientists as well as Absent-minded Professors. What kind of person is the Egghead? Are the criteria, and attributed social roles, perceived in the same way by persons of widely different socio-economic and cultural positions? By sampling citizens of different social worlds it was anticipated that such differences in imagery would be uncovered.

The theoretical base for this study is the sociology of knowledge. Generally this area of sociological theory has concerned itself with the social sources of ideas, with the inter-relationship of socio-economic factors and values, attitudes and ideologies.

A debate arose within the sociology of knowledge early in this century: the materialist school of Marx and Mannheim³ stressed that

socio-economic position and class membership determine beliefs and knowledge structure. The Sorokin school and writers like Stanley Taylor⁴ have gone further, and allowed for the reciprocal influence of social class position and belief or knowledge structure. This study is not an attempt to prove whether ideas come before social position or vice versa. An attempt to discover whether a relationship exists between class and belief need not involve our making causal statements. Rather the study tests the sociology of knowledge argument which mediates the debate by attesting that there is a clear relation between class and belief, and that different knowledge structures are associated with different socio-economic worlds.⁵ There are social roots in all mental life.⁶

Having related the problem and framework of the study, we turn to the specific research questions which were posed, and to the relevant literature.

The Research Questions

It was suggested above that this is the first research to focus on public imagery about the intellectual, that the approach has been exploratory. Chapter I outlined the concept, and mentioned the names of Richard Hofstadter and Lewis Coser as authors of important histories of contemporary intellectualism. The histories of certain types of intellectuals, and studies of the social role of the man of knowledge have been made without recourse to empirical data and some studies have empirically investigated the intellectual's own perception of his status, role, institutional affiliations and problems. In this vein are Coser's Men of Ideas, Lazarsfeld and Thielens' The Academic Mind, Logan Wilson's The Academic Man: A Study in the Sociology of a Profession, and Melvin

Seeman's "The Intellectual and the Language of Minorities".⁷ However, the societal definition has not yet been researched. Even if we know the professor's image of the public view of his role, that connotation is in danger of reification if someone does not examine the public image firsthand.

A number of sociological questions arise from speculating "what does the label mean to various groups and strata?" This project proceeds to seek answers to broadly exploratory research questions, which may, it is hoped, lead to the derivation of hypotheses about the public image of the intellectual.

Since we proceed from the viewpoint of the sociology of knowledge, it is appropriate to start from the postulate made by Robert K. Merton in his discussion of the bureaucratization of intellectuals:

that perspectives and outlook are largely a product of social position. Intellectuals are oriented toward more or less defined social circles and accommodate their interests, attitudes, and objectives to these circles. The demands and expectations inherent in a social position tend to shape the behavior of occupants of that position.⁸

If certain social circles or social worlds have greater demands to make of so-called intellectuals, we assume that a social world which is socially distant from the intellectuals' world will have less demand for and fewer expectations of men of ideas. These assumptions lead us to the first Research Question.

Question One

Will persons of different social class positions differ in their descriptions and stated images of 'the intellectual'? If so, in what ways will they differ?

Changing environments have influenced the category we now label as 'intellectual': he is now "a man who carries a briefcase",⁹ but a century ago he was the 'scholar', and in Europe a member of the 'intelligentsia', whether a philosopher or poet.¹⁰ It must be stressed that the history of the intellectual as described by Coser, or Hofstadter, or Benda, really does not help us predict which traits will be attributed by which segments of the public.

Few empirical studies reported in the sociological literature are relevant to this question of how disparate groups will perceive intellectual roles, occupations, statuses, institutional affiliations, interests and goals. Cognitive differences of social classes have usually been conducted with only one group, such as "Moral Perspectives of Blue-Collar Workers", investigated by Robert Endleman;¹¹ or "The Behavior and Values of Skilled Workers" in which Richard F. Hamilton questioned the middle-class values allegedly infiltrating skilled workers.¹² We are told by Endleman, although in the context of moral judgments about criminal behavior, that opinions of blue-collar workers

are likely to be rather crude, one-dimensional, dogmatic, across-the-board--especially seen in blanket condemnations, lumping together a great variety of types and severity of offenses, coalescing minor peccadilloes with such things as gang-fight knifings;. . . a common stereotyped response to all of the subtly different hypothetical conflict situations.

By contrast, middle-class men, especially the more highly educated, are more likely to pose distinctions in moral issues according to the severity of the offense, the type of values that are challenged, to make subtle, often legalistic distinctions. . . Generally the middle-class are better able to think in terms of general principles (again, most likely, a function of higher education) and to deal with specific cases in relation to such general ideas, whereas the worker tends to be more concrete and more limited to the special details of the particular case, and also, correspondingly, tends to personalize moral issues.¹³

Can we predict that the views of working-class subjects will be similarly one-dimensional and dogmatic of so-called intellectuals, personalized to "a guy I know. ."? Will the highly educated middle-class make generalizations and specify sub-types? Or is the topic of the label of the 'intellectual' a matter of indifference to these strata, without the moral implications of discussing criminal behavior? By the use of open-ended questions we hope to elicit responses that clarify this area.

It is not strictly the generality or specificity of the image which is of interest, but also what dimensions are involved? Do descriptions of intellectuals vary in the perception of the basic nature of intellectualism? That is, do different social classes have varied ideas on the inborn or acquired characteristics that define so-called intellectuals from non-intellectuals?

Research is lacking on the qualities perceived as essential to intellectuals, but some evidence is available regarding professors and scientists, certainly intellectual sub-types. Demos and Belok tapped "The Professorial Image" with sentence-completion questionnaires of a sample of veterans in California.¹⁴ They noted studies of college professor imagery in literature

Boys studied the treatment of college life in fiction. He found the professor treated as a special breed and states, '...to our writers of fiction the college professor is usually a queer person, not to be judged by the usual standards of conduct.' Belok in a study of the professor in novels found that many professors were depicted as odd, disagreeable, and sometimes vicious individuals. . . Bowman studied general magazines and found many criticisms of college professors. The unfavorable image of the professor frequently found in these media is that he is usually dull, unsocial, unmanly, impractical, overcritical and lazy.¹⁵

In their own study, Demos and Belok report that the veterans not only considered professors to be intelligent and learned, but also underpaid, and some considered them 'old fogies'.

Apparently the belief that professors are a 'special breed' is not restricted to fiction or motion pictures. This is clearly indicated in the completions of the sentence: 'From what people say of professors. .' There were a large number of responses stating that professors are somewhat of a special breed. Characteristic of these responses were:

They are altogether different.

You would think they are a separate breed.

You'd think they were Gods or Devils.

One is led to believe they fall into a special category.¹⁶

Unfortunately, Demos and Belok do not report the socio-economic distribution of their results, so that we do not know if "specialness" was uniformly or differently perceived by social class. The present research will consider such an analysis.

A number of studies of the images of scientists are reported in The Sociology of Science, edited by Bernard Barber and Walter Hirsch.¹⁷ We shall consider three of these: by Mead and Metraux, another by Withey, the third by Beardslee and O'Dowd.

In 1956-57, Margaret Mead and Phoda Metraux investigated "The Image of the Scientist among High-School Students".¹⁸ Their report carefully charts the clusters of response, of teenagers in 120 American high schools, to show that while the official image of the scientist is very positive, the mystique of laboratory work and its isolation also gives a strongly negative image.

The composite image of the scientist will be quoted in part, first the general role conception, then the positive and negative sub-images of personality and goals.

The scientist is a man who wears a white coat and works in a laboratory. He is elderly or middle-aged and wears glasses. . . . He may wear a beard, may be unshaven and unkempt. He may be stooped and tired. He is surrounded by equipment. . . . He spends his days doing experiments.

The image then diverges. Positive side:

He is a very intelligent man--a genius or almost a genius. He has long years of expensive training. . . . during which he studied very hard. . . . He is careful, patient, devoted, courageous, open-minded. . . . does not jump to conclusions, and stands up for his ideas even when attacked. . . . He is prepared to work for years without getting results and face the possibility of failure without discouragement; he will try again. He wants to know the answer. . . . He is a dedicated man who works not for money or fame or self-glory, but--like Madame Curie, Einstein, Oppenheimer, Salk--for the benefit of mankind and the welfare of his country. . . . The future rests on his shoulders.

Negative side:

The scientist is a brain. He spends his days indoors, sitting in a laboratory. . . . His work is uninteresting, dull, monotonous, tedious, time consuming, and though he works for years, he may see no results or may fail, and he is likely to receive neither adequate recompense nor recognition. . . . If he works by himself, he is alone and has heavy expenses. If he works for a big company, he has to do as he is told, and his discoveries must be turned over to the company and may not be used. . . . If he works for the government, he has to keep dangerous secrets. . . . He may even sell secrets to the enemy. His work may be dangerous. He may not believe in God or may lose his religion. . . . he is so involved in his work that he doesn't know what is going on in the world. He has no social life, no other intellectual interest, no hobbies or relaxations. He bores his wife, his children and their friends--for he has no friends of his own. . . . with incessant talk that no one can understand; or else he pays no attention or has secrets he cannot share. . . . No one wants to be such a scientist or to marry him.¹⁹

As Mead and Metraux comment, the official image is positive, but is so idealistic as to seem dead.

While the rejection in the negative image is, of course, immediately clear, the positive image of very hard, only occasionally rewarding, very responsible work is also

one which, while it is respected, has very little attraction for young Americans today.

The number of ways in which the image of the scientist contains extremes which appear to be contradictory. . . .all represent deviations from the accepted way of life, from being a normal friendly human being, who lives like other people and gets along with other people.²⁰

Most important for our own study are the documentations of positive, idealistic stereotypes, and negative, de-humanized images--which will be compared with our data on the intellectual. Since this profile of the scientist was made by teenage high-school students, it is unknown if it will apply to our Canadian adult sample. One study of the opinions of adults was Stephen B. Withey's "Public Opinion about Science and Scientists", which presented a series of agree-disagree statements in a two-part study, before and after Sputnik.²¹ The statement most agreed upon was "Most scientists want to work on things that will make life better for the average person." (88% of respondents said Agree).

Of interest because of its lack of consensus was this statement: "Scientists are apt to be odd and peculiar people." (40% Agreed, 52% Disagreed). Withey does not report any sex, age, or socio-economic distribution of his results. One item which implies that his respondents did not consider scientists to be intellectual is: "Most scientists are mainly interested in knowledge for its own sake; they don't care much about its practical value" (26% Agreed, 65% Disagreed). Withey comments on the pragmatic perception of science, that medicine, human living and welfare, and the military are the most typical components of the 'totem pole' of science.²² His conclusion has important implications for the present study on the difficulty of tapping ambivalent attitudes.

The scientists are seen as well-meaning, brilliant, hard-working people. Their less appealing characteristics--off-beat and peculiar--are elicited only when the observer probes. On the surface the natives are quiet, supportive, and appreciative but there is some questioning, some alert watching, and considerable mistrust. The public will wait and see; they have no reason to do anything else, and many have no other place to turn.²³

The questions which such statements elicit for research on the public image of 'the intellectual' include specifying which of 'the natives' are supportive, which are mistrustful, and what is the extent of curiosity, interest, or apathy toward the man of ideas. Is there an image extant about the 'off-beat and peculiar' characteristics of intellectuals? How will social class divisions of the public aid the differentiation of whatever imagery exists?

Thirdly, David C. Beardslee and Donald D. O'Dowd gave a questionnaire to find "The College-Student Image of the Scientist".²⁴ The semantic differential was used, with students ranking fifteen occupations in 48 seven-point scales. The authors found that sex, type of college, year of program, socio-economic family background, even community type do not differentiate students in their beliefs about scientists. Does this mean simply that there was an almost universal image of the scientist among students in colleges who are able to watch men of science at work in their laboratories? That is, are college-student views influenced by the proximity and visibility of scientists on their campuses? If Beardslee and O'Dowd had clarified their findings more, we might have answered this question. The bearing on the Research Question is whether the college-educated adults in our own sample will have a universal image of the intellectual, since we might assume that that type was visible to them during their advanced years of education.

Beardslee and O'Dowd's respondents had more detailed and diverse images than Mead and Metraux' high-school-age sample. We would infer that even greater diversity in the images of intellectuals will be available from a sample of Edmonton adults whose educations and socio-economic statuses range widely.

The scientist as a sub-type of the general 'intellectual' social type is most clearly illustrated by Beardslee and O'Dowd's summary of the college-student image:

The scientist, according to college students, is outstanding in several respects. Students see him most prominently as a highly intelligent person with a strong tendency to be both individualistic and radical in personal and social outlook. . The scientist is seen as socially withdrawn; he is indifferent to people, retiring, and somewhat depressed. He is coldly intellectual in some spheres of his life--mainly in his work--and he is emotional in his response to social and political appeals. . . He is clearly an intellectual, but unlike 'eggheads' in the humanities, he is characterized by a vigorous and directed use of his intelligence. The image conveys a sense of strength of personality, but it is a little extreme, a little strange, somewhat contradictory, and, therefore, hard to comprehend.²⁵

Beardslee and O'Dowd go on to comment on the profiles of scientist and college professor.

Both occupations are entered by men of high intelligence with personality characteristics represented by high scores on self-sufficient and persevering, middle values on strong, active, confident and self-assertive, and low scores on stable and adaptable in habits. Both professions are believed to attract men who are, to a high degree, radical and individualistic. .²⁶

A correlation of .91 occurred between teachers of science and students of one college when some of the scales were given to both groups.²⁷ It is not unlikely to find consensus in an institution about a type which is highly familiar to its members, but will this consensus hold for

persons whose social world is remote? If our research were considering a defined occupational group, like 'scientist' or 'professor', prediction might be made about the role-taking of particular social groups, but 'the intellectual' is a generalized category, social type, and combination of social roles. We cannot predict whether there will exist a generally accepted universal image, having seen the varied definitions attached by historians of intellectualism.

A study which was not about scientists or other intellectual sub-types, but which is relevant to the present Research Question was Samuel M. Strong's "Social Types in a Minority Group", done in Chicago in 1934.²⁸ It was an early attempt at social typing, by means of asking members of the Negro ghetto to name the types which characterized the community, then questioning in-group and out-group Chicagoans as to these labels. Although the precise types, their labels and characteristics, are of interest, more relevant to this section are the findings which compared samples. Strong discovered which social types in the Negro community were indigenous, by having his black assistants administer the questionnaire to ghetto residents. But when he administered the most widely known ghetto social types to white middle class residents and white university students, he found that the Negro social types were not known to them.

Only a small number of the social types were identified by the whites. Of the few identified, there was no knowledge of what they meant to Negroes. There seems to be very little awareness among the general society of the lines of orientation prevalent in the Negro social world, of the run of attention of the various social levels, and of the problems and concerns confronting the people. In the light of these results it may be stated that a study of such indigenous social types tends to indicate also the degree of separation between the two social worlds: that of the minority group and that of the superordinate general society.²⁹

Whereas Strong was presenting a specialized list of typing categories and labels to his respondents, we shall take only the general 'intellectual' label to be studied. It is evident that Strong's study of a racially and socio-economically distinct minority group's labels is not the same as studying two socio-economic groups' categorizations for 'the intellectual'. Only the professor samples can equate to Strong's ghetto in-group, but we anticipate similarly different lines of orientation between the two economically discrete out-groups as well. Each group should have different collective preoccupations.

Let us leave the first research question with the reminder that virtually all empirical and theoretical literature about public imagery about scientists, academics or 'intellectuals' has used American or European data; no Canadian studies have yet been made.

In summary, we have seen that the empirical researches undertaken which relate to the different perceptions held by different groups do not relate precisely to 'the intellectual'. Three studies of the scientist showed that even high school students had a diverse image of the man of science; however, it was stereotyped both positively and negatively. College students distinguished different traits of scientists, viewing him as more cold and rational than the professor, yet somewhat unstable outside the laboratory. The adults sampled were not examined in the same way as either of the other scientist-projects, and they were even more ambivalent about men of science.

Whereas the blue-collar working class respondents were shown in one study of attitudes to be simplistic, rigid, and rather uni-dimensional in comparison to middle-class respondents, another study showed that these citizens could be authoritative when examined about

social types which fitted their ghetto environment. The dates of the researches covered over twenty years, and inconsistency may in part be due to changes in the images of social types studied, as well as in the social worlds of the respondents at various times.

We can predict relative to the discrete samples of high status and low status respondents in this study, that if the intellectual seems to be indigenous to their social world, they will be informative respondents, insofar as their limited vocabularies and greater tendency to stereotype simplistically will let them. Of the better-educated middle class respondents, we anticipate a diverse image, positively and negatively held, with a clear attribution of role to 'the intellectual'.

Question Two

What social position are intellectuals perceived to occupy?

We are concerned here with the public's perception of intellectuals' status, power, and organizational affiliations. The literature reveals that intellectuals are greatly concerned about their position in society, but there is little information about the public's image of the intellectuals' position.

The high-school students studied by Mead and Metraux considered the scientist to be working in a variety of settings, with contradictions of status and rewards. The composite picture cited earlier included men who worked alone in laboratories and those who worked for big companies or government wherein their work was closely supervised. Some were perceived to be poorly paid, others could be imagined selling secrets for money, power and prestige. As the negative stereotype

clearly showed, the teenagers believed that science was a lonely way of life, demanding total commitment which resulted in alienation from others.³⁰ The occupational roles attributed to scientists may partially obtain in regard to the general intellectual type, but questions arise. Will we find, as Beardslee and O'Dowd did, that the scientist, college professor, engineer, artist, teacher are all grouped "as intellectual roles", whose occupants are dissimilar from "individuals in any of the business and industrial occupations"?³¹

Whatever imagery of occupational and economic status, independence or institutional affiliations of intellectuals is held by respondents, it will provide the focal point for our interpretation. As indicated by the definitions of the intellectual discussed in Chapter I, the line between the intellectual and non-intellectual is often drawn in terms of the boundaries of his daily work sphere. Lipset and Coser exemplify the point. For Lipset, the definition is clearly occupational: "all those who create, distribute, and apply culture, that is, the symbolic world of man, including art, science, and religion."³² Coser has criticized this definition as obscuring "distinctive characteristics" which transcend occupation to the approach these people take towards ideas and standards, and we are reminded that "not all academic men are intellectuals".³³ Yet, to most laymen in contemporary North America, their self-image is basically their occupational status, and it will be expected that occupational referents will mould respondents' views of intellectuals.

As Klapp has asserted, one judges how well people know a social world by their knowledge of the social types in it.³⁴ Klapp's comment was made in the context of clarifying the function of social typing

"to specify much of the informal structure and special situations that develop, for example, variations in people within a status. ."³⁵ And so we find that when Coser, in his Men of Ideas, reaches "The Intellectual in Contemporary America", he must introduce intellectual types and institutional settings. He discusses intellectuals who are unattached, academic, scientific, in Washington and in the mass-culture industries.³⁶

An extensive literature is concerned with the affiliations of contemporary intellectuals in America: their involvement in roles in industry and government has been interpreted as leading to 'bureaucratization' and away from 'unattached' objectivity.³⁷ The intriguing debate on the future of the intellectual in a technical society is not pertinent to a study of public perspectives. We can, however, ask whether there are two kinds of intellectuals--attached and unattached--perceived in the imagery of the social type. Are writers and artists connoted when discussing so-called intellectuals, or are scientists and engineers brought to mind? And does 'professor' have a specific referent of theoretical or applied varieties? Yet another problematic area here is whether the intellectual is now considered to be a specialist rather than a generalist. Does the public imagery retain traces of the European idea of a broadly concerned 'intelligentsia',³⁸ or has the 'expert' become the dominant conception?

The literature on intellectuals provides a fascinating background for these questions, which we will document briefly with reference to comments by Merton, Coser, Hofstadter and Znaniecki. Znaniecki felt that intellectualism has permeated the culture, and varieties of men of knowledge evolved.

The conviction that secular theoretical knowledge is the most important part of personal culture and that personal culture raises man's inner worth and makes him more valuable to society is manifested in the fact that the process of democratization has been everywhere--in America more than anywhere else--accompanied by the spread of an ever higher and broader intellectual education, admitting the masses to a growing share in disinterested general knowledge. And the scholarly claim that the acquisition of systematic theoretic knowledge is a better preparation for practical leadership than the kind of education in which knowledge is treated as a mere instrument for practice has led to a progressive academization of the preparatory training for professional roles.³⁹

Lewis Coser describes contemporary American intellectuals as "located in a great variety of institutional settings as well as in the interstices between a number of institutional orders".⁴⁰ Bravely, he attempts to trace these involvements:

In earlier periods, unattached intellectuals. . . made up the bulk of all intellectuals. In an age dominated by large-scale organizations, their specific weight has declined markedly. Yet even today their importance looms large in assessments of the future of the intellectual vocation. Academic intellectuals. . . are numerically and strategically the most important group among contemporary intellectuals. . . Scientific intellectuals, although many of them operate within the academic community, are often located outside it, and a separate chapter is therefore devoted to a discussion of this category. Two subsequent chapters discuss the status and role of intellectuals in the bureaucratic settings of the mass-culture industries and of public administration. These settings, especially the second, have recently attracted considerable numbers of intellectuals, and it seems mandatory to inquire into how far they are conducive to the enhancement or, alternatively, the inhibition of the intellectual's tasks and vocation.⁴¹

At this point, Merton should be cited to clarify the conceptions of unattached and organizationally committed intellectuals. His discussion deals with intellectuals involved in human affairs, rather than physical and biological scientists:

We can conveniently classify these intellectuals into two major types: those who exercise advisory and technical functions within a bureaucracy and those intellectuals who are not attached to a bureaucracy. The distinction is pointed up by recognizing a difference in the 'client' of the two kinds of intellectuals: for the bureaucratic intellectual, it is those policy-makers in the organization for whom he is, directly or remotely, performing a staff function; for the unattached intellectual, the clientele is a public.⁴²

Merton includes academic men "among the unattached intellectuals, despite their connection with an 'academic bureaucracy'. Their role differs from that of bureaucratic intellectuals since they typically, according to Merton, "are not expected to utilize their specialized knowledge for shaping the policies of the bureaucracy".⁴³ He argues that the bureaucratized intellectual runs the risk of becoming partisan to the policies of the organization, supplying expertise and implementing policy in a "dependency-relation to the executive".⁴⁴ The implications for power and influence are varied, but can extend to the highest level of governmental advisors: the brain-trust of American presidents.

The earlier in the continuum of decision that the bureaucratic intellectual operates, the greater his potential influence in guiding the decision. When the area of inquiry is vaguely indicated by the policy-maker, the intellectual's research can, within limits, focus attention on certain alternative lines of action by ascribing greater weight to certain types of evidence. This seems to have been the case, for example, with Wilson's Fourteen Points which were, in large part, the outgrowth of an appraisal of the total situation by intellectuals 'whose brains he borrowed', to use the President's own phrase. In helping to establish such general frameworks of policy, the intellectual can initiate some control from below.⁴⁵

These observations suggest questions about the imagery and attitudes held by particular interest-groups in the social structure toward intellectuals.

Is the intellectual perceived to be a valuable Expert, and does this relate to the perceiving respondent's own occupational utilization of expert aid? Do respondents who do not need consultation with so-called intellectuals in their own jobs have an image of the intellectual as Impractical? The historians of intellectualism, particularly Hofstadter and Coser, have shown that some of the greatest antipathy toward men of knowledge comes from the most practical people in American life: businessmen.⁴⁶ While the leaders of large corporations, like the leaders of government, recognize the need to keep in touch with the innovations of the intellectuals, they are suspicious of the theoretical bent of men of knowledge. There seems to be fear that the intellectual has potential to radically change the social system, and businessmen react conservatively to such threats.

One historian has gone so far as to say that whenever business sits in the driver's seat, as it did in the 1920's and as it does today, (1953 comment) the distrust of the intellectual is both epidemic and dominant.⁴⁷

The distrust has been mutual, and frequently criticism of men of policy-making power has led intellectuals to serious confrontations with authorities, which in the United States in the thirties and fifties led to the public association of 'intellectualism' with 'radicalism', and which today is producing an image of 'pacifism', that professors are naive flower children.⁴⁸ Thus, in addition to the perception of occupational roles of intellectuals, will our Canadian respondents view the intellectual as doing threatening or useful work? What will be the connoted attitudes toward intellectual employments? The lack of study of intellectuals in Canada hampers our prediction of results. One of the few writers who has commented on the status of Canadian

intellectuals is John Porter, who considers them part of 'the clerisy' of the elite 'establishment' which runs the country.⁴⁹ His view is partial, because he only treats the professors who belong to The Royal Society of Canada as our intellectual-clerisy. His purpose was to examine those who were powerful within the ideological system, and not the entire social type.⁵⁰

We must bring home again to the reader, that depending on a writer's purpose, he will broaden or narrow his own definition of an intellectual. And what appear under some formulations to be criteria necessary before one defines men of knowledge, in another case are taken for granted as traits of all intellectuals. In the present study, we examine the occupations perceived to relate to intellectuals, whereas to Lipset or Shils, Porter or even Merton, occupational assumptions had to be made before they could discuss the intellectual category. Shils has a specific view, in fact:

In the contemporary world this category includes university teachers, scientists, university students, writers, artists, secondary-school teachers, members of the learned professions (law, medicine and the church), journalists, and higher civil servants, as well as a scattering of businessmen, engineers, and army officers.⁵¹

Will all of these be represented in the public view of intellectual occupations?

In summary, particular institutional affiliations are perceived very frequently to be appropriate to the intellectual: particularly academic life. Some writers and sociologists regard the arts, the educational institution generally, whether university or public school, certain of the professional fields, particularly the highly verbal ones, to 'fit' intellectuals. While the empirical research discussed

in the former section implied that the scientist was usually considered to work on his own in a laboratory, the image was also evident that he could be employed by industry or government.

Members of the press who discuss intellectualism seem to link it with the university, as was evident in Chapter I. But John Porter was mentioned as restricting his discussion to the small number of intellectuals in Canada who are members of The Royal Society, whether these are scientists, writers, or professors in the social sciences.

As we build the image of the intellectual, a vital area of consideration is that of intellectual goals.

Question Three

What goals and values are attributed to intellectuals?

Are the interests they pursue considered to be unique to intellectuals?

Here we investigate one of the commonest criteria for differentiating intellectuals from supposedly non-intellectual people, that of the values which intellectuals consider most important to them. In Chapter I, it was pointed out that the phrase, 'the man of ideas' indicates an essential quality of persons considered to be intellectuals; that they live for ideas. The meaning of the phrase 'for ideas' brings us to those beliefs which make intellectuals perform roles irrelevant to non-intellectuals.

Conceptually, values should be differentiated from goals.

Goals are objectives, "the qualities it is desired to bring about by social action": whereas values are the standards which set the goals, or are principles which determine the ordering of goals into systems and the legitimate means of their attainment".⁵² Together with belief, which is the acceptance of any given proposition as true and real for

the observer, values and goals constitute the ideology, the system of beliefs. This clarifies the viewpoint that the so-called intellectual is a person whose system of beliefs, goals and values gives him certain priorities of action. He marches to a different drummer from the businessman, the factory member of the union, the prince or the housewife.

Mannheim distinguished three types of intellectual: those persons so classifiable because of their life-long careers as vocational men of ideas; second those leisure-time intellectuals who maintain occupations unrelated to their spare-time concern with culture and ideas, and those whose intellectualism is a passing phase of life, as youths becoming educated.⁵³ For Mannheim, the basis is a "transcending impulse" which is a lasting or temporary reaching out from previous realities to groping with new interpretations, examining alternatives and conclusions in order to arrive at new knowledge.⁵⁴ The value, then, would be an insistence in allowing all avenues of exploration their due consideration, with the goal being change in its broad sense of arriving at new realities. The view of intellectuals as critics and reformers can be seen to stem from these beliefs in 'transcendence'. And Mannheim is not alone in emphasizing change as a goal. Historians of the intelligentsia in Europe and the scholar and modern intellectual in America agree that close examination of the status quo has been the essence of the pursuit of ideas.⁵⁵

For Merton, the pursuit of ideas is a demanding duty:

We shall consider persons as intellectuals in so far as they devote themselves to cultivating and formulating knowledge. They have access to and advance a cultural fund of knowledge which does not derive solely from their direct personal experience.⁵⁶

There is a sense of priorities--the intellectual who does not 'devote' himself to the goal of accumulating knowledge, or distributing knowledge, is somehow betraying his function. We can turn this to an empirical query: is the intellectual considered a public servant who is seeking answers to societal problems, or is he viewed as a person who simply 'wants to know' and to satisfy his own curiosity? Is his criticism beneficial?

In the empirical researches considered in this chapter, a mixture of personal and social goals of particular kinds of intellectuals were cited. The scientist-profile of Mead and Metraux uncovered varied points of view⁵⁷ held by the students regarding scientist goals. The man of science was considered to be working principally for the welfare and benefit of the society, and only secondarily was it supposed that a scientist would possibly work for self-glory, or if desperate for fortune, he might sell secrets to the Enemy. Definitely the students perceived the scientist as pursuing his research first, because he wanted to find the answers to problems, 'to know', and second, because he was employed by a large corporation or government who commissioned him to do the job.

Withey's study of public attitudes toward science similarly found that 88% agreed that "Most scientists want to work on things that will make life better for the average person".⁵⁸ Withey also reports that 26% agreed, but fully 65% disagreed with the statement "Most scientists are mainly interested in knowledge for its own sake; they don't care much about its practical value".⁵⁹ It can be anticipated that one single goal will not be uniformly perceived to apply to the so-called intellectual. But because the category is more generalized

than the scientist, will there be more stress by respondents on the general pursuit of ideas, or will specific occupational or status goals be seen as fitting the man of knowledge as well?

We anticipate that there will be a personal appropriateness of the goals attributed to intellectuals by the subjects perceiving them. After all--

Even in the formulation of concepts, the angle of vision is guided by the observer's interests. Thought, namely, is directed in accordance with what a particular social group expects.⁶⁰

Will the blue-collar worker with a Grade Nine education view the intellectual as someone playing with ideas for the joy of it, or will he see the so-called intellectual as motivated by money and the prestige of a title before his name? Will the professional man, who attained a university education, describe the intellectual's goals and interests in a very different way? Hofstadter's argument is theoretical, not empirical, but illuminates the goals and values differentiating intellectuals from the educated.

A man in any of the learned or quasi-learned professions must have command of a substantial store of frozen ideas to do his work; he must, if he does it well, use them intelligently; but in his professional capacity he uses them mainly as instruments. The heart of the matter--to borrow a distinction made by Max Weber about politics--is that the professional man lives off ideas, not for them. His professional role, his professional skills, do not make him an intellectual. . . .if he is, it is because he brings to his profession a distinctive feeling about ideas which is not required by his job. . . he has a sense of dedication to the life of the mind which is very much like a religious commitment. This is not surprising, for in a very important way the role of the intellectual is inherited from the office of the cleric: it implies a special sense of the ultimate value in existence of the act of comprehension.⁶¹

If this is the intellectual's self-image, we might use it as a yardstick to show the familiarity respondents have with intellectualism.

Hofstadter vividly asserts that the intellectual may have practical concern and goals, but that these are secondary, the primary interest is "a quality in problems that is not defined by asking whether or not they have practical purpose".⁶² Although this view of intellectualism is convincingly argued, and Hofstadter's writing is credited with being the seminal work on American intellectuals, we must put it to the empirical test. We shall investigate the goals of intellectuals that are reported by Canadian academics who have the reputation of intellectualism, to see if they express the same essential search for elusive truths as their own reasons for pursuing ideas.

Hofstadter admits that the goals which intellectuals are pursuing are exceptional and sometimes considered suspect by pragmatic Americans. This is the basis of his 432-page book documenting and analyzing anti-intellectualism.

It is a part of the intellectual's tragedy that the things he most values about himself and his work are quite unlike those society values in him. Society values him because he can in fact be used for a variety of purposes, from popular entertainment to the design of weapons. But it can hardly understand so well those aspects of his temperament which I have designated as essential to his intellectualism. His playfulness, in its various manifestations, is likely to seem to most men a perverse luxury; in the United States the play of the mind is perhaps the only form of play that is not looked upon with the most tender indulgence. His piety is likely to seem nettlesome, if not actually dangerous. And neither quality is considered to contribute very much to the practical business of life.⁶³

The impact of American pragmatism here is clear, but what can be said of Canadian perceptions of intellectual goals? There is little

Canadian data as yet reported, but some suggestions are found in Porter's comments on the ideological elite. Because it is his purpose to explore the elites, his view of intellectuals is narrow.

A view of intellectuals as a class opposed to the social order is, of course, wrong. As many trained and brilliant minds have helped to shore up social orders as have helped to tear them down. As intellectuals become polarized they engage in a dynamic dialogue and have an important function in social change. As we have seen earlier, there has been little of this dynamism in Canada's political system. There is probably even less of it in Canadian intellectual life. From the mass media to the halls of higher learning the clerisy is firmly entrenched. Neither Canadian newspapers, churches, nor universities have harboured social critics in any large number, and there are some interesting examples of pressure extended on members of these bodies who have become too critical.⁶⁴

From Porter's work, several questions arise. Is it possible that intellectuals do pursue the goal of prestige which drives others to popular acclaim, but that they wish recognition and acclaim solely from their fellow intellectuals? Not only might their 'reference group' be restricted to peers and academic superiors, but the public, if aware of this, might say that the only friends of the scientist were other scientists. A social world which is somewhat isolated from other audiences invites stereotyping in the imagery imputed to it.⁶⁵

In summary, this section has discussed the goals which are attributed to intellectuals in the empirical and historical literature. Empirically, researches into the image of the scientist found him imputed to be working more for societal benefits than for his own satisfaction or status. However, descriptions of the intellectual's goals elsewhere point to a trend that his major goals relate to his own satisfaction in the pursuit of ideas, which are perhaps practical

or theoretical. As before, the literature is mostly American, however Canada's intellectual elite was discussed by Porter, for whom the intellectual professor named to The Royal Society is probably seeking fame as much as he pursues scholarship. We will find it pertinent to not only ask all sub-samples of respondents about their perceptions of intellectual goals, but we shall ask the academic sample about their own career-goals.

We are led, then, to ask what exposure to the public intellectuals might have, how public media would portray them.

Question Four

What are the images of intellectuals portrayed in popular culture--over avant-garde and mass media? What will be the differences in imagery of intellectuals by persons consuming different aspects of popular culture?

In other words, can we separate respondents culturally by denoting different quality levels of the mass media? And, what are the images of the intellectual carried by each level?

Theoretical interest in the mass media relates to the extent to which its various forms, written, oral or visual, transmit symbolic portraits of such social types as 'the intellectual'. Lasswell argued that social types have

specific connotations in terms of the interests, concerns, and dispositions of the group. This model has a configuration of personality characteristics, a role or roles, and a status or statuses usually well understood locally and often in the general society--increasingly so with the growth of mass communication. Actual persons may be identified as various social types for a short or a long time--a few seconds or a lifetime. Thus, the 'pillar of the community' is a description which is easily identified.⁶⁶

Has Perry Mason, whether the plump figure of Paymond Burr as played on television, or the description in Gardiner's books, come to symbolize Lawyers? Similarly do Dr. Kildare and Ben Casey stand for the medical profession, and Our Miss Brooks and Mr. Novak symbolize teachers for very many today? We can speculate on the reinforcement of the stereotype of the Mad Scientist by Wayne and Schuster's skits involving "Professor Weingartner".⁶⁷ The alienated and ineffectual academic has been extensively portrayed in all media: we think of many novels ranging from Saul Bellow's Hertzog back to Thomas Wolfe's Look Homeward Angel, and of many Hollywood films as well.⁶⁸

For explanations of how various audiences are involved and exposed to such labels, we turn to the arguments of the analysts of popular culture. That term covers a variety of entertainment products and values, outlined by Lazarsfeld as

three levels of culture which in colloquial terms are often called highbrow, middlebrow, and lowbrow culture. The classification, although vague, is useful and perhaps inevitable. When we talk of highbrow culture we think of enduring works of art and the contemporary efforts of avant-gardists who deserve respect because of the seriousness of their intentions. We think of the average movie, the family magazine, or the respectable television program when we use the term middlebrow. By lowbrow we mean such things as comics, detective stories, and vaudeville. It is no coincidence that the examples are cultural products offered to people rather than activities in which they themselves engage.⁶⁹

We know that there are qualitative differences in the products of culture: The Atlantic Monthly is on a 'level' above True Story; and in television, Bonanza appeals differently to audiences than does Explorations. Patrick Hazard summarizes "There is a continuum of excellence available in mass society; one man's excellence is another's

mediocrity. The converse is also true".⁷⁰ Because of relative valuation, it is arbitrary to reliably classify any movie, radio or television series, book, magazine or comic strip into categories such as "highbrow", "middlebrow" or "lowbrow".

No consumer can buy all the products offered, and in the realm of popular culture this applies because of time limitations as well as economic limitations. The social-psychological principle of 'selective perception',⁷¹ is expanded to include selective exposure of media offerings. Although in a city such as Edmonton, the available programs of television, radio and movies, and the books, magazines and newspapers are dependent on the offerings of limited communication channels,⁷² there are still far more items of news, opinions and entertainment than any citizen can digest.

We accept the principle of culture analysts like Lazarsfeld, Shils, Wilensky, Dwight Macdonald, Fussell Lynes, Ernest van den Haag, Oscar Handlin, Leo Rosten, Rosenberg and White and many others⁷³ that levels of quality of cultural offerings exist and can be demarcated. Where do we break the "continuum of excellence" to best reveal the natural groupings of degree and kind? With Lazarsfeld in using highbrow, middlebrow and lowbrow, are Shils, Lynes, Macdonald--analysts who feel that after designating the avant-garde or creative work in a genre as highbrow or High Culture, a further distinction should be made between the mediocre which imitates the trends of the avant-garde on a wide slick Midcult or middlebrow scale, and the vulgarized level of lowbrow or Masscult which aims at instant popularity and immediate emotional response.⁷⁴ Values are inherent in all levels, as Dwight Macdonald illustrates in criticizing the pretensions of middlebrow:

The contrast of faith (good) with cleverness (bad) is typical of Midcult as is the acceptance of liberalistic moralizing as a satisfactory substitute for talent. Indeed talent makes the middlebrow uneasy.⁷⁵

Macdonald argues that the mass audience is divisible, is "not One Big Audience but rather a number of smaller, more specialized audiences that may still be commercially profitable" and which should take advantage of the tremendous variety of cultural products so that cultural homogenization does not occur:

If there were a clearly defined cultural elite here, then the masses could have their Kitsch and the classes could have their High Culture with everybody happy. But a significant part of our population is chronically confronted with a choice between looking at TV or old masters, between reading Tolstoy or a detective story; i.e. the pattern of their cultural lives is 'open' to the point of being porous. For a lucky few, this openness of choice is stimulating. But for most, it is confusing and leads at best to that middlebrow compromise called Midcult.⁷⁶

Middlebrow culture has come to be the mainstream of offering by the media, and of acceptance by various publics. When Harold Wilensky sought to study high-brow and low-brow exposure, he found that Macdonald and Shils were right, that everybody in America is exposed to mass culture,⁷⁷ and that he had to add a 'middle' category:

Perhaps the most telling data demonstrating the interpretation of brow levels, not merely in television viewing but also in reading, come from my samples in the Detroit area. Most of those who read at least one high-brow magazine, also read middle- or low-brow magazines. Only 3 per cent of all these men read only high-brow magazines.⁷⁸

If the citizen switches on a television set, or turns a radio dial, or looks into the daily newspaper or the monthly magazine, he is likely being exposed to middle-class images and values, offered at a middlebrow level of content-quality. It is argued that the United

States tends toward a "middle mush", which according to Leo Bogart, is removing the differences between classes:

A review of the evidence suggests that there is no simple, clear-cut distinction to be drawn between the place of the mass media in working-class family life and their place in other sectors of American society. To the contrary, the mass media represent perhaps the most powerful current by which blue-collar workers are swept into the mainstream of conformity to middle-class values and aspirations.⁷⁹

Leo Bogart reports that the middle-class are more print-oriented, the lower-classes more television-oriented, that grade and high school educated are both dependent on television and newspaper in equal amounts, but the college-educated rely on newspapers most, and radio is important only to grade-schoolers.⁸⁰ We might propose that lack of familiarity with men of ideas is indicated by this finding:

A study done among readers of Harper's and The Atlantic shows that only 6% of the subscribers fall into the skilled, semi-skilled and laborer category. . . . However, 67% of readers of True Story types of magazines were blue-collar wives.⁸¹

Since there has never before been a study of the relationship between media involvement and the image of the so-called intellectual, we can only infer that people underexposed to the highbrow level of media would have a simplistic view of The Highbrow. What would be the attitudes of the socially deprived?

A shred of evidence can be drawn from a study of Alan F. Blum of lower-class Negroes.

The effects of underprivilege and low status upon the viewer's perception of media reality are quite direct: he is exposed to a picture of reality with which he has no experience, and of a performer who is a type of person that he has never confronted in his daily existence. The dissonance which he experiences when he attempts to match his own image of life with the perspective created by the medium generates a resentment in him which must be dis-

charged in some way; the lower-class Negroes whom we observed invested this hostility into personal, joking relationships with the television performers.⁸²

It is not yet known when the public becomes concerned with the image of the intellectual, either jokingly, angrily, or admiringly.

Canada is in the peculiar situation of having more extensive exposure to American popular culture than to our own. Also, Canada has not the saturation in print and on the air of America, partially due to geographic dispersion of communities, and partially to the later start of private enterprise in a country overshadowed by American popular culture. Data of great interest are found in Porter's Chapter XV, and in John A. Irving's edited collection on Mass Media in Canada.⁸³ We will see that it is impossible to attribute Canadian attitudes toward such social types as intellectuals when the media which convey attitudes and values are dominated by America.

Science fiction is a midcult sphere of short-story and book writing which may impart clear portraits of at least the scientific intellectual. There are few studies of other intellectual types, so we are back with the scientist, one of the few intellectual sub-types to whom we can refer in examining portrayals on the mass media. Walter Hirsch studied the image of the scientist in science fiction in a sample of magazine stories published between 1926 and 1950.⁸⁴ He assumes that science fiction writers speak for a scientific ethos, attracting a readership which includes many practicing scientists and which features a "rather high degree of intercommunication between writers and readers".⁸⁵

In science fiction during the time studied by Hirsch, the usual villain was a scientist or a businessman, yet the scientist was

the hero twice as often as he played villain. As Hirsch states, the anti-science view of British authors like Orwell or Huxley

is not typical of American science fiction in spite of the critical success of these authors and of American writers like Ray Bradbury. On the other hand, . . . naive adulation of the omnipotent and omniscient scientist is no longer a feature of the genre as it had been in its childhood.

Another trend was increasingly to depict the scientist in a bureaucratic rather than an independent setting unencumbered by interpersonal problems. Thus the conventional themes of 'Frankenstein' and 'Scientist as Savior' tend to decline over Hirsch's study period, while he claims "a relative increase in themes of Hubris--the scientist blasphemously attempting to attack natural or divine law--or the 'Scientist as Martyr'".⁸⁷ It may be due to writing for a more sophisticated readership, from lowcult to midcult. In science fiction stories, problems are solved less and less by human insight and heroism, and more by the intervention of 'aliens' from other planets. It is interesting that Hirsch's study was done prior to Sputnik, and undoubtedly a different pattern would be found now. Hirsch's closing comments are of note, that despite the loss of the belief of omnipotence, no wave of pessimism is evident:

There appears to be a greater recognition of the reality principle, 'of the complexity of human behavior, of the 'unanticipated consequences of purposive human action,' as Merton has termed it. If the 'aliens' represent any sort of principle or power, it would seem to be 'chance' rather than some anthropomorphic deity. . . . Scientists are no longer either supermen or stereotyped villains but real human beings who are facing moral dilemmas and who recognize that science alone is an inadequate guide for the choices they must make.⁸⁸

The latter statement would seem to substantiate Hirsch's claim that science fiction represents a scientific ethos. Such a fair assessment was not the conclusion of Mead and Metraux, or of Beardslee and O'Dowd's

cantly virile. The suggestion is powerfully rendered that books, libraries, abstract ideas, laboratories, museums, the ivy-covered towers of a university, are somehow emasculating, while factories, executive suites, mine shafts, bridges being thrown across dangerous rivers, trucks on long night rides over lonely highways, lend themselves per se to the rich full existence.⁹¹

A parallel should be drawn between this image over lowbrow and middle-brow media, and that found by Mead and Metraux in their analysis of the high-school student imagery of scientists, cited earlier. In the fictional studies of Boys, Belok and Bowman, the image of the professor was also that of an odd person, "dull, unsocial, unmanly".⁹² Gurko's description is much more vivid, and his data are not substantiated with rigorous statistics of the frequency of his encounter of these negative viewpoints. Nevertheless, readers of slick middlebrow American women's magazines in the mid-fifties will recall the formula which was part of the fictional mystique which reinforced the value of practicality over that of intellect. We shall discuss that American tendency very shortly, in presenting the literature on anti-intellectualism.

In considering the images of the intellectual portrayed by various mass media, it is essential to recognize that uniformity is not the case. For every Gurko crying that the man of ideas is portrayed as bumbling or inhuman in lowbrow movies or popular short stories, we find a Hirsch with data from another genre (or a higher cultural level of media)--science fiction--where the portrayal is of real human beings facing moral dilemmas.⁹³ And while the 'little magazines' which formerly appealed to a small audience of artistic pace-setters, have declined, eminent scholars and serious subjects appear more frequently in 'the slicks'.⁹⁴ In Canada, Saturday Night and The Canadian Forum struggle along beside the more successful Chatelaine and Star Weekly;

and in television we are offered ballets on Festival as well as horse opera-homilies on Bonanza.

Highbrow culture may be threatened, but it is not yet extinct, and it is the argument of Coser that even if the intellectuals are increasingly specialized and fragmented institutionally, avant garde ideas are circulated by the serious magazines, involving men of knowledge with issues and opinions.

. .a word must be said about the role of 'high-brow' magazines in bridging the gaps among various compartmentalized intellectual milieux. . . We may argue that the British intellectual magazine expresses the interests of a relatively integrated intellectual community, whereas the American 'high brow' magazine helps only to bridge the gaps among various fragments of the intellectual world. In England, The Times Literary Supplement is read by 'everybody who is anybody' and it publishes every week general articles and reviews matched in the United States only by little magazines. Despite its wide circulation, it still manages to serve as a kind of family journal, expressing the fairly cohesive judgments of the members of the literary and scholarly establishments. . . In contrast, the audience for magazines with intellectual pretensions is more fragmented in America, as the low figures of high-level magazines show. Although none of these 'high brow' media reaches more than a fraction of the total intellectual community, together they nevertheless serve to crisscross this community and therefore to help bind together men who would otherwise tend to withdraw into absorption with the specialized problems of their disciplines and professions.⁹⁵

In Canada, many intellectuals utilize the radio as their medium of debate and exchange. University and public service stations in several localities supplement the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's highbrow programming. Of the latter, John Irving says:

CBC Radio has unquestionably been the greatest stimulant of cultural and intellectual values that Canada has known. It may fairly be claimed that, with the exception of the BBC, no other radio corporation has equalled the CBC's involvement in all the ideas that are in circulation in the contemporary world.⁹⁶

Of course, these are the minority when compared to the greater number of private radio stations which feed middle and lowbrow cultural messages to housewives and teenagers. Like other media in the mass-culture industries, commercial radio has not fostered intellectualism. The bias against intellect will be discussed shortly in connection with the conflict of business and intellectualism, throughout American history.

In summary, we have examined the arbitrary categorizing of mass media levels into 'highbrow', 'middlebrow' and 'lowbrow', or 'highcult', 'midcult' and 'lowcult'. Such analysts as Harold Wilensky, Dwight Macdonald and Russell Lynes have found it useful to discuss these three levels of quality of such media as books, television, magazines and radio programs. In seeking additionally to find the cultural items related to the image of the intellectual on the mass media, we found particular relevance in the description of lowbrow and middlebrow movie and magazine images by Leo Gurko, and the science fiction image of the scientist analyzed by Walter Hirsch. It would appear that the American media examined by Gurko were not sympathetic to the intellectual, though some idealization took place. Science fiction was depicted as more positive in imagery, pragmatic and yet ambivalent toward men of knowledge. We have little concrete evidence that Canada's natively-produced mass media will be either very different from, or less receptive than, the American literature and programming which inundates us. Indeed, John Irving's book traces a rather balanced history of Canadian radio and television. We shall ask respondents their media involvements, and see if there are relationships between quality of media or type of media and the subsequent imagery expressed about the intellectual. Trends in attitudes toward intellectuals also relate to the mass media images we have outlined.

Question Five

To what extent does the public exhibit anti-intellectual attitudes?

The extent of anti-intellectualism among Americans is now adequately documented thanks to Richard Hofstadter's Anti-Intellectualism in American Life.⁹⁷ Concern with feelings expressed in the descriptions of intellectuals extends to the favorable as well as to the unfavorable. However, having available such an influential work leads us to an examination of negative attitudes, their roots and the extent to which we might predict they will be held, with regard to the so-called intellectual social type.

The Introductory Chapter outlined the Edmonton situation when data-gathering was taking place, and the quotations at the beginning of that chapter introduced anti-intellectualism to the reader.

Feelings about intellectuals are often a mixture of awe and distrust, and what Hofstadter refers to as anti-intellectualism includes more vehement negative attitudes, it is

a resentment and suspicion of the life of the
the mind and of those who are considered to
represent it; and a disposition constantly to
minimize the value of that life.⁹⁸

Such a definition is appropriate to our own study, when clarified by excluding the non-intellectual who is simply indifferent to or unaware of men of ideas, and by including people who are hostile toward intellectual types, and those who are suspicious of the pursuit of knowledge as a worthy goal. But since the phenomenon of anti-intellectualism, or ambivalence,⁹⁹ or respect for the intellectual--any aspect of attitude--has never been empirically studied, the appropriate dimensions to tap these feelings toward intellectuals are not known.

We can point out the pervasiveness of negative feelings toward the intellectual, as detailed by Hofstadter:

Although I am convinced that anti-intellectualism is pervasive in our culture, I believe that it can rarely be called dominant. Again and again I have noticed, . . . that the more mild and benign forms of anti-intellectualism prove to be the most widespread, whereas the most malign forms are found mainly among small if vociferous minority groups. . . . I believe it has been present in some form and degree in most societies; in one it takes the form of the administering of hemlock, in another of town-and-gown riots, in another of censorship and regimentation, in still another of Congressional investigations. I am disposed to believe that anti-intellectualism, though it has its own universality, may be considered a part of our English cultural inheritance, and that it is notably strong in Anglo-American experience.¹⁰⁰

The evident implications for Western Canada are that there should be as much distrust of the man of knowledge here, for our Anglo-Saxon inheritance is more recent than America's.

Dimensions of anti-intellectualism are many, but we are particularly interested in those attitudes which relate to the academic intellectual, for our study was conducted during the local crisis over a school-teacher's dismissal, and our sub-sample includes a number of university professors. Leo Gurko was quoted in Chapter I discussing the prejudice against female intellectuals, perceived to be less in femininity--this was very clearly related by both Gurko and Hofstadter to the schoolteacher in American life. The fact that "schoolmarms" early in this century were often unmarried women was part of the stereotype which evolved in an emotional, nearly sexless conception of both public schoolteacher and university academic:

Insofar as the teacher stands before his pupils as a surrogate of the intellectual life and its rewards, he unwittingly makes this life appear altogether unattractive.¹⁰¹

The male American schoolmaster was typified in Washington Irving's Ichabod Crane as a lank scarecrow of a figure, an "odd mixture of small shrewdness and simple credulity".¹⁰² Having males outnumbered by females in the educational profession means that

The boys grow up thinking of men teachers as somewhat effeminate and treat them with a curious mixture of genteel deference (of the sort due to women) and hearty male condescension. In a certain constricted sense, the male teacher may be respected, but he is not 'one of the boys'.¹⁰³

Ideas and learning, which are supposed to make men impotent, women sexless, and people in general mousy and withdrawn, have also been credited, in popular myths, with having the opposite effects. The man of ideas, in some configurations, is a dried-out, bookish, nearsighted stick, but in others he is seductive, dangerous, and full of worldly temptations. The very title Professor acquired in nineteenth-century America overtones of rascality and cunning. . . . His most potent shape has been the Devil, and the Devil, in nearly all versions, has been intellectually superior to God. . . The struggle between them is posed in terms of the struggle between morality and brains, these two elements being conceived as not only separable but antagonistic. Theologically, braininess has acquired a distinct flavor of wickedness. Intellectual brilliance, at the very least, is something to be distrusted.¹⁰⁴

As Hofstadter, and finally, vividly, Gurko, have argued, the conception of the academic intellectual may be both someone to be pitied or condescended to, or it may be of someone potent and to be distrusted. We will anticipate attitudes of at least superficial respect, but some ambivalent suspicion to be held toward the teacher-intellectuals, by at least the myth-believing of our respondents. That is, the negative stereotype will be more appropriate to respondents for whom the intellectual is narrowly conceived of. We do not know whether the attitudes will be consistent, for we can only cite literature to show that attitudes to scientists were not consistent. Mead and Metraux uncovered considerable ambivalence toward the man of science, discussed

with Question One in this Chapter. While the students considered the scientist to be devoted to his work, they were suspicious that he was alienated, perhaps neglectful of his family, and maybe even traitorous if not watched closely.¹⁰⁵

The quotations cited above lead to a number of questions to pursue in this research. Will the teacher as well as the scientist be prototypes of the intellectual, and thus will there be an undercurrent of disdain for the sexless, bookish academic, as well as distrust of the power these people have for 'warping young minds', or for 'selling secrets to the Enemy'? Lest the reader infer that anti-intellectualism is going to be hunted down with a reverse witch-hunting in this project, we remind you that its extent is unknown here. Indifference is more likely:

The greater part of the public, and a great part even of the intelligent and alert public, is simply non-intellectual; it is infused with enough ambivalence about intellect and intellectuals to be swayed now this way and now that on current cultural issues. It has an ingrained distrust of eggheads, but also a genuine yearning for enlightenment and culture. . . . Although I am convinced that anti-intellectualism is pervasive in our culture, I believe that it can rarely be called dominant.¹⁰⁶

Insufficient studies of the phenomenon of anti-intellectualism in Canada have been undertaken for us to say how pervasive it is here. As Chapter I suggested, when an issue divides a university campus from its non-university citizens, the public ambivalence is activated toward intellectuals. But will we find indifference, distrust, and approval in measurable proportions?

Will extant anti-intellectualism concentrate on the impracticality of men of ideas or their villainy? If we anticipate that

Canada--or even Western Canada--is as basically pragmatic as the United States, then we should find that intellectuals are looked down on as ineffective and rather useless. But while the utilitarianism of farm and small town is evident in the cultural and political habits of Alberta, so is a deep strain of religious fundamentalism.¹⁰⁷ It is the "old-fashioned principles of religion and morality" which Hofstadter finds related to the kind of anti-intellectualism which calls men of ideas "immoral, dangerous, and subversive".¹⁰⁸ Our study will attempt to differentiate the kinds of attitudes held by a Western Canadian sample of citizens.

Summary

This chapter has posed and discussed five major research questions in consideration of the contemporary image of the intellectual held by a Canadian public. What are the differing images, stereotypes and categories of thought, held by people of different social classes? What social positions and statuses are intellectuals perceived to occupy today? What are the goals and values attributed to intellectuals by different groups, the academics, bureaucrats and 'other people'? What are the different images of intellectual types found in popular and high culture? What is the extent of anti-intellectualism today, particularly in Canada?

These questions, and the entire research into the images of the social type called 'the intellectual' stem from a basic tenet of the sociology of knowledge that the perceptions of people are influenced by their own social conditions, past histories and basic categories of thought. Because the intellectual is considered different, a man of knowledge and ideas instead of a man of practicality and labour, it is

argued that different groups in different social worlds throughout the society, will have different perceptions and attitudes toward 'the intellectual'. The following chapter will discuss the methodology utilized in this exploratory study.

FOOTNOTES CHAPTER II

1. Karl Mannheim, Ideology and Utopia (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company; A Harvest Book, 1959) p. 265.
2. Orrin E. Klapp, Heroes, Villains and Fools (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.; A Spectrum Book, 1962) p. 9.
3. Karl Marx, A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1904, p. 11; Karl Mannheim, Essays in the Sociology of Knowledge (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956).
Werner Stark, The Sociology of Knowledge, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958).
4. Pitirim A. Sorokin, Social and Cultural Dynamics (New York: American Book Company, 1941).
Stanley Taylor, Conceptions of Institutions and the Theory of Knowledge (New York: Bookman Associates, 1956).
5. Karl Mannheim, op. cit.; Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, Revised and Enlarged Edition (Glencoe: Free Press, 1957), Part III "The Sociology of Knowledge and Mass Communications".
6. Irving Louis Horowitz, Philosophy, Science and the Sociology of Knowledge, (Springfield, Illinois: C.C. Thomas, 1961).
7. Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Wagner Thielens, Jr., The Academic Mind (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958); Logan Wilson, The Academic Man: A Study in the Sociology of a Profession, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1942); Melvin Seeman, "The Intellectual and the Language of Minorities", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 64, No. 1 (July, 1958), pp. 25-35.
8. This is argued by Merton, op. cit., in Part III, especially p. 462. It is also the basis of Taylor's and Horowitz' respective arguments, op. cit.
9. Jacques Barzun facetiously defined an intellectual this way in God's Country and Mine (Boston: Little, Brown, 1957).
10. The 'intelligentsia' is differentiated from intellectuals by historical usage to apply to the class or stratum of intellectual people who made an elite body of advisors and critics in Europe. However, Arthur Koestler considers the intelligentsia to be the class of "thinking man that aspires to independent knowledge". in "The Intelligentsia", Partisan Review, 11 (Summer, 1944) pp. 265-277.
11. Robert Endleman, "Moral Perspectives of Blue-Collar Workers", in Blue-Collar World, eds. Arthur B. Shostak and William Gomberg (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1965), pp. 308-316.

12. Richard F. Hamilton, "The Behavior and Values of Skilled Workers" in Blue-Collar World, ibid., pp. 42-57.
13. Endleman, op. cit., p. 311.
14. George D. Demos and Michael V. Belok, "The Professorial Image", Vocational Guidance Quarterly, Vol. 12, No. 1 (Autumn 1963), pp. 46-49.
15. Richard C. Boys, "The American College in Fiction", College English, Vol. 7 (April 1946), pp. 379-387. Michael V. Belok, The College Professor in the Novel, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1958. Claude C. Bowman, The College Professor in America (Philadelphia: University Pennsylvania Press, 1938).
16. Demos and Belok, op.cit., p. 47.
17. Bernard Barber and Walter Hirsch, eds., The Sociology of Science (New York: The Free Press, 1962). The book has a section titled "The Social Image of the Scientist and His Self-Conceptions", wherein these articles are found.
18. Margaret Mead and Rhoda Metraux, "The Image of the Scientist among High-School Students: A Pilot Study" in Barber and Hirsch, ibid., pp. 230-246.
19. Ibid., pp. 237-240.
20. Ibid., pp. 240, 241.
21. Stephen B. Withey, "Public Opinion about Science and Scientists", in Barber and Hirsch, op. cit., pp. 153-159. The subsequent statements quoted are found on pp. 158-159.
22. Ibid., p. 159.
23. Ibid.
24. David C. Beardslee and Donald D. O'Dowd, "The College-Student Image of the Scientists", in Barber and Hirsch, op. cit., pp. 247-258.
25. Ibid., p. 249.
26. Ibid., pp. 250-251.
27. "The main differences between the two groups were, first, that the students attributed much more influence in public affairs to the scientist than the science teachers did, and, second, that members of the science faculty saw the scientist as more interested in art. Otherwise, the two groups were in close agreement." Beardslee and O'Dowd, op. cit., p. 253.

28. Samuel M. Strong, "Social Types in a Minority Group: Formulation of a Method", AJS, XLVIII (March 1943), pp. 563-573; which seems to have been researched in 1934.
29. Ibid., p. 572.
30. See page 26 of this Chapter, quoting Mead and Metraux, op. cit., pp. 237-240.
31. Beardslee and O'Dowd, op. cit., p. 250.
32. S.M. Lipset, Political Man (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co. Ltd., Anchor Books, 1960), p. 333.
33. Coser, Men of Ideas, op. cit., Preface, pp. vii-viii.
34. Klapp, Heroes, Villains and Fools, op. cit., p. 19.
35. Ibid.
36. Lewis A. Coser, Men of Ideas: A Sociologist's View (New York: The Free Press, 1965, Contents.
37. Merton, op.cit., p. 212, cites the recruitment of young intellectuals in the United States by public bureaucracies. "Two aspects of this development deserve attention: (1) its implications for a change in the values of younger intellectuals and (2) the ways in which the bureaucracy converts politically-minded intellectuals into technicians."
38. Ernest Manheim, in his Introduction to Karl Mannheim's Essays on the Sociology of Culture, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1962) traces 19th century's "fluid and open 'stratum': What makes this intelligentsia unique among its historic variants is its multipolarity, its mobility, its exposure to a variety of viewpoints, its capacity to choose and change affiliations, and an expanding radius of empathy. By historical standards the periods of a relatively detached and fluid intelligentsia constituted brief episodes between the epochs of institutionally controlled thinking in which closed groups monopolized the public interpretation of things." p. 11.
39. Florian Znaniecki, The Social Role of the Man of Knowledge (New York: Columbia University Press, 1940), pp. 162-163. He continued: "In law, medicine, surgery, military and civil engineering, architecture, agriculture, forestry, animal husbandry, finance, commerce, diplomacy, social work, and so on, important and responsible functions are mainly, if not exclusively, entrusted to people who during childhood and early youth were taught for the most part theoretical subjects with little or no bearing on their future occupations and later had several years of academic instruction in which practical knowledge is treated as an application of a fundamental body of systematic scholarly knowledge."

40. Coser, op. cit., p. 249.
41. Ibid.
42. Merton, op. cit., pp. 211-212.
43. Ibid., in footnote 7, p. 212.
44. Ibid., p. 213.
45. Ibid., p. 216. Coser extensively discusses intellectuals in power, including the "Brain Trust" backing F.D. Roosevelt during the New Deal, and European examples such as Trotsky, Hobbes and Keynes, who were very influential. Op. cit., pp. 136-142.
46. Richard Hofstadter, Anti-Intellectualism in American Life (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), devotes an entire section of the book to the incompatibilities between the American men of business, pragmatic and caught in the mystique of 'self-help', and the men of ideas, pp. 233-296. Coser traces the historical background that related intellectuals to policy-makers: "Sooner or later most of them found that they were forced to make the choice of either saying 'yes' to power and hence becoming courtiers, experts, or technicians or reverting to the status of unattached, autonomous, and critical intellectuals. The fate of Thomas More is a paradigm in this respect". Coser, op. cit., p. 139.
47. Merle Curti, "Intellectuals and Other People", The American Historical Review (after this, AHR), LX, 2 (January 1955), p. 265, citing Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., "The Highbrow in Politics", Partisan Review, XX (March-April 1953), pp. 162-165.
48. The interrelationship of so-called intellectuals with modern radicalism and liberalism is the subject of Christopher Lasch's The New Radicalism in America (1889-1963), The Intellectual as a Social Type (New York: A. Knopf, 1965). "...the new radicals understood the end of social and political reform to be the improvement of the quality of American culture as a whole, rather than simply a way of equalizing the opportunities for economic self-advancement. It is precisely this confusion of politics and culture, so essential to the new radicalism, that seems to me to betray its origins in the rise of the intellectual class; for such a program, with its suggestion that men of learning occupy or ought to occupy the strategic loci of social control, has an obvious appeal to intellectuals newly conscious of their own common tie and common interests". Lasch, Introduction, p. xiv.
49. John Porter, The Vertical Mosaic (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), pp. 457-467, where he discusses the concern of Canadian intellectuals for national values distributed by the mass media; and pp. 491-519, which defines Canadian intellectuals as a clerisy led by The Royal Society of Canada.

50. Porter, ibid., p. 493. "By definition those intellectuals who are powerful within the ideological system are the traditionalists, the clerisy, the ideologists, the conservatives. They occupy editorial and professorial chairs and the bishop's palaces. . . . (p. 495) To determine who in Canada constitute the existing clerisy itself makes judgments about who rates. Fortunately for present purposes the clerisy of the higher learning is to be found in the exclusive and self-selecting Royal Society of Canada".
51. Edward Shils, "Mass Society and Its Culture," in Culture for the Millions?, ed. by Norman Jacobs (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964) p. 9.
52. Don Martindale, Community, Character and Civilization (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1963), p. 296.
53. Mannheim, Essays on the Sociology of Culture (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956), p. 263.
54. Ibid., pp. 164-165.
55. Coser and Hofstadter will be mentioned shortly, but this view exists in earlier works by Thomas Molnar, The Decline of the Intellectual (Cleveland, Ohio: The World Publishing Company, Meridian Books, 1961), which includes provocative distinctions between American and European intellectuals; and Julien Benda's The Great Betrayal (London: Routledge, 1928) which argued that the best way for the intellectual to maintain the objectivity necessary for a critical stance, was to be unaffiliated from the political and bureaucratic structure of the society.
56. Merton, op. cit., p. 209. Hofstadter's definition illuminates this: "Intellect. . . is the critical, creative, and contemplative side of mind. . ." op. cit., p. 25, and quoted fully in Chapter I. Merton's phrase "in so far as they devote themselves" raises again the possibility of intellectualism being transient. Lipset had to admit, that though intellectuals "create, distribute and apply culture" (see quotes 32 and 33), the "hard core" are the creators and distributors only; op. cit., p. 333.
57. Mead and Metraux, op. cit., pp. 238-239.
58. Stephen Withey, op. cit., p. 159.
59. Ibid.
60. Karl Mannheim, Ideology and Utopia, op. cit., p. 273.
61. Hofstadter, op. cit., pp. 26-27.
62. Ibid., p. 31.
63. Ibid., p. 33.

64. John Porter, op. cit., pp. 492-494.
65. An argument to this effect was posited by Merton in "The Ambivalence of Scientists", in Science and Society, ed. by Norman Kaplan (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1965), pp. 112-132. Scientists themselves "assume that the truly dedicated scientist must be concerned only with advancing knowledge. As a result, their deep interest in having their priority recognized by peers is seen as marring their nobility of purpose as men of science. . . . This assumption has a germ of psychological truth: any reward--fame, money, position-- is morally ambiguous and potentially subversive of culturally esteemed motives," (p. 121). Such a view is clarified by Shibutani's definition of reference group as "that group whose presumed perspective is used by an actor as the frame of reference in the organization of his perceptual field" from "Preference Groups and Social Control" in Rose, op. cit., p. 132. Shibutani goes on to a thorough discussion of social worlds, each of which is a "culture area, the boundaries of which are set neither by territory nor formal group membership, but by the limits of effective communication." p. 136.
66. Thomas E. Lasswell, Class and Stratum (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1965), p. 136, part of his excellent Chapter 7 "Cognitive Schemata and the Personal View of Social Classes" to which I owe my own view of the typing process. This passage begins with a quotation from Samuel M. Strong, "Social Types in a Minority Group: Formulation of a Method", op. cit., p. 563, which reads "Such types are creations inside the collective life of the group. They are constructs which the group arrives at by selecting or abstracting accented forms of conduct displayed by some of its members and having specific connotations" etc.
67. For many years, Canadian comedians Johnny Wayne and Frank Schuster have performed on CBC radio and television a variety of skits in which Schuster interviews the professor on his latest mad invention or proclaimed cure for any malady. The plot involves the reporter questioning "Weingartner" until the professor's hilarious illogic and unpracticality is revealed.
68. Saul Bellow, Hertzog (New York: Viking, 1964), a very vivid portrayal of an unhappy man, unable to handle his personal or marital morass. As alienated was Thomas Wolfe, whose Look Homeward Angel (New York: Scribner, 1929) described the writer as outsider. Edward Albee's play Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf? (New York: Atheneum, 1962) is the most recent example of a hit movie based on the bickering of a frustrated faculty wife and her inept professor of history spouse.
69. Paul F. Lazarsfeld "Mass Culture Today", introduction to Culture for the Millions? ed. by Norman Jacobs (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964) p. xi.
70. Patrick Hazard, during the panel discussion on "A General Theory of Mass Culture" in Jacobs, ibid., p. 157.

71. See T.M. Newcomb and E.L. Hartley, eds., Reading in Social Psychology (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1947) pp. 204-210; and M. Sherif and H. Cantril, The Psychology of Ego-Involvements (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1947), pp. 68-76.
72. At the time of data collection, Edmonton had two television stations, five city radio stations, one daily newspaper, two reputable book-stores (with about five smaller ones), and circulating movies, books and magazines too numerous to count.
73. In Jacobs' Culture for the Millions?, op. cit., are several relevant views: Lazarsfeld, op. cit., pp. i-xxv; Edward Shils, "Mass Society and Its Culture" pp. 1-27; Ernest van den Haag, "A Dissent from the Consensual Society", pp. 53-62; Oscar Handlin, "Comments on Mass and Popular Culture", pp. 63-70; and Leo Posten, "The Intellectual and the Mass Media: Some Rigorously Pandom Remarks," pp. 71-84. Bernard Rosenberg and David Manning White edited a collection of articles on Mass Culture, (Glencoe: The Falcon's Wing Press, Free Press, 1957). As vital are Russell Lynes, "Highbrow, Lowbrow, Middlebrow" in his The Taste-Makers, (New York: Harper and Bros., 1954 edition) pp. 310-341; Dwight Macdonald, Against the American Grain, (New York: Random House, Inc. 1962), especially pp. 1-75; Harold L. Wilensky, "Mass Society and Mass Culture: Interdependence or Independence?" A.S.P., 29,2 (April, 1964), pp. 173-197; Leo Lowenthal, Literature, Popular Culture, and Society (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., A Spectrum Book, 1961) pp. 1-51.
74. The symposium constituting Jacobs' book, op. cit., produced disagreement between Shils who defined the three levels of mass culture as "superior or refined culture", "mediocre culture" and "brutal culture" (pp. 4-6), and van den Haag. The latter argued that "much lowbrow culture is maudlin and sentimental rather than brutal" and "middlebrow culture objects are not necessarily mediocre" (pp. 53, 59).
75. Dwight Macdonald, op. cit., Precedes this statement with an elaboration of Midcult characteristics: "Midcult has the essential qualities of Masscult--the formula, the built-in reaction, the lack of any standard except popularity-- but it decently covers them with a cultural figleaf. In Masscult the trick is plain--to please the crowd by any means. But Midcult has it both ways: it pretends to respect the standards of High Culture while in fact it waters them down and vulgarizes them. . . .It is its ambiguity that makes Midcult alarming. For it presents itself as part of High Culture. Not that coterie stuff, not those snobbish inbred so-called intellectuals who are only talking to themselves. Rather the great vital mainstream, wide and clear though perhaps not so deep. . ." (pp. 36, 39).
76. Dwight Macdonald, op. cit., p. 34. Most of the culture analysts have axes to grind as obviously as Macdonald's. In a way, the very openness of choice can be threatening to members of the avant garde who decry the inroads they perceive middlebrow promoters and

audiences have made into their sphere--the mystery has faded from intellectualism. Definitions of audiences, and the value perceived of media consumption all hinge on the analysts' assumptions of the interests of culture-producers and propagators and the extent of cultural uniformity; whether it is cause for optimism or pessimism. We do not consider the debate relevant to this research except as it affects the so-called theories of mass culture to which we have recourse. Despite Harold Wilensky's intention to differentiate high culture from mass, he seems to interchange a highbrow-lowbrow dichotomy and three-way analysis, op. cit., p. 194. The present research will utilize three-level analysis, and will find in the analysis if "relaxing the definition" is at all necessary. In effect, Wilensky's high-brow category is dropped to include some middle-brow items in order that he locate "media purists", who therefore would not seem very "pure".

77. Wilensky, op. cit., p. 190 agrees with Shils that "high culture has always been precarious. But what is new, unique to our time, is a thorough interpenetration of cultural levels; the good, the mediocre, and the trashy are becoming fused in one massive middle mush. . . . There is little doubt from my data as well as others' that educated strata--even products of graduate and professional schools--are becoming full participants in mass culture; they spend a reduced fraction of time in exposure to quality print and film. This trend extends to the professors, writers, artists, scientists--the keepers of high culture themselves-- and the chief culprit, again is TV."
78. Wilensky, ibid., pp. 193-194.
79. Leo Bogart, "The Mass Media and the Blue-Collar Worker" in Blue-Collar World, ed. by Shostak and Gomberg, op. cit., p. 417.
80. Ibid., pp. 416-427.
81. Ibid., p. 427.
82. Alan F. Blum, "Lower-Class Negro Television Spectators: The Concept of Pseudo-Jovial Skepticism" in Blue-Collar World, op. cit., p. 443.
83. Porter, op. cit., particularly pp. 457-462, and pp. 468-471. John A. Irving, ed., Mass Media in Canada (Toronto: Pyerson Press, 1962), in which each chapter presents the history in Canada of one of the media. Of particular interest are Bruce Raymond's article on Radio, and Irving's own introductory and concluding chapters.
84. Walter Hirsch, "The Image of the Scientist in Science Fiction: A Content Analysis," in Barber and Hirsch, op. cit., pp. 259-268.
85. Hirsch, ibid., p. 262.
86. Ibid., p. 265.

87. Ibid., pp. 265-266.
88. Ibid., p. 267.
89. Leo Gurko, Heroes, Highbrows and the Popular Mind (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, A Charter Book, 1962).
90. Gurko, ibid., pp. 32-37. He uses a Leslie Howard movie of 1937, entitled Stand-In, as his prime example of the process by which Hollywood 'normalizes' intellectuals in American movies: "We see him at the beginning, a thin, stooped, rather faded young man, with tortoise-shell glasses which he continually removes and puts on nervously, walking through the offices of the bank reeling off dictation involving high and complicated numbers to a harried secretary following him at two paces. His eye has a remote look, and the pallor of his skin indicates that his life has been led indoors. . . (After which, he goes to Hollywood to assist on a film, and learns that people aren't numbers). . . By this time his whole appearance has changed. He has shed his spectacles, straightened up noticeably; his eye, once glazed, is now bright; his complexion, even on a black and white screen, has acquired a healthy tone. His speech is no longer a monotonous jumble of abstruse computations, but vigorous and direct. . . . He kisses her with authority, a sign that he has acquired the confidence and 'knowhow' no American male can do without. His transformation from bookworm to man is complete."
91. Gurko, ibid., pp. 38-41, the passage concludes: "Our fictional scholar is cut off from the life of action by ideas. We come here to the root of the matter: men who think, write or talk too much are emotionally inadequate; faith must be placed in men of action. The strong link that is presumed to exist between thought and impotence has its reverse in the bond that connects practicality and virility. These bonds and links are forged over and over again in the novelettes (complete in one issue), serials, short stories and short-shorts published in vast numbers by the popular magazines of the country."
92. See quotation and footnote 15 in this chapter; Richard C. Boys, Michael V. Belok, and Claude C. Bowman, whose respective studies of the image of the professor were noted there.
93. Middlebrow media is inconsistent, some of it is positive and some of it is negative toward the intellectual.
94. Lewis Coser presents a fascinating history of two of the "little magazines" in America between 1911 and 1930, The Masses and The Little Review, in his Men of Ideas, op. cit., pp. 121-132.
95. Coser, ibid., pp. 353-354. The circulation figures alluded to are: "A major avant garde literary magazine like Partisan Review prints only about 10,000 copies of each issue; Commentary, the leading monthly organ of New York liberalism, prints 35,000 copies; the circulation of The New Republic has risen considerably, but it still

sells only around 100,000 copies." Further details of circulation of publications and the mass culture industry are found in American Culture in the Sixties, ed. Vinetta Colby (New York: H.W. Wilson, 1964.)

96. John A. Irving, "The Problems of the Mass Media", in Irving, op. cit., p. 231.
97. Hofstadter, op. cit., p. 26.
98. Ibid., p. 7.
99. Ambivalence is defined by Webster's Third New International Dictionary, Unabridged (Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1967) as: "1. contradictory emotional or psychological attitudes, especially toward a particular person or object and often with one attitude inhibiting the expression of another. (And) simultaneous attraction toward and repulsion from an object, person, or action." This is an excellent concept with which to label attitudes toward the intellectual, as we shall see in the data analysis, for that is a common state of feeling.
100. Hofstadter, op. cit., pp. 19-20.
101. Ibid., p. 312.
102. Ibid., p. 315. Hofstadter's full quotation from Washington Irving's story will be presented in Chapter VI, when describing the physical image of the intellectual in our data.
103. Ibid., p. 320.
104. Leo Gurko, op. cit., pp. 49-62. This passage includes a fascinating quote on the 'professor' character description in Ross Lockridge's novel Paintree County--truly a lowbrow historical romance.
105. Mead and Metraux, op. cit.,
106. Hofstadter, op. cit., p. 19.
107. Gerald Clark, Canada--The Uneasy Neighbor (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1965), and the histories of the development of Social Credit during the depression: C.B. Macpherson's Democracy in Alberta (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1953) and John A. Irving's The Social Credit Movement in Alberta (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959). Fundamentalism was appropriate to Alberta's 'boom-recession' economy, according to W.F. Mann, "Sect and Cult in Western Canada" in Blishen, op. cit., p. 406. "Especially after 1930, the socio-economic situation in Alberta called for institutions to support the traditional values against the impact of urbanism, modernism, and acute social dislocations. This was one prominent function of the evangelical sects."
108. Hofstadter, loc. cit.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY I: DATA COLLECTION

In his efforts toward accuracy, an investigator must steer a course between two hazards: on the one hand, he must maintain a healthy skepticism about the reliability and validity of any information and a constant awareness of the possible sources of error and distortion; on the other hand, he must realize that reliability and validity are relative and that an extremely high degree of accuracy may be not only unattainable in terms of his budget but also unnecessary in terms of his study.

- Stephen A. Richardson et.al. .
Interviewing: Its Forms
and Functions

In this chapter we will deal with sampling procedures, questionnaire and interview procedure, and content analysis and computer analysis of results, in that order.

An exploratory study faces the problems alluded to above in intensity, and the methods devised for this study of the public image of the intellectual have unknown reliability and face validity. Certain methodological decisions were made, however, to facilitate the maximum possible results, in clarifying the concept of this social type.

The city of Edmonton was chosen as the site for the study, for such reasons as the low budget of the Edmonton-based researcher, and for its controversy over the roles played by certain academics. The Introductory chapter describes the relevance for the study of the campus-city furor in late 1963.

The study was conducted through the winter of 1964-65, when the population of greater Edmonton was approximately 350,000. The argument of the thesis hinges on different social worlds of respondents,

therefore it was decided to sample to ensure a wide range of socio-economic backgrounds. In order to survey an equitable distribution of the sexes, the original intention to sample divergent occupational categories--such as lawyers and packing-plant workers--was rejected. Even in a comparatively small, young, middle-class city like Edmonton, de facto segregation in residence occurs.¹ The 1961 Census was used to select two areas of the city which would yield respectively, respondents of the professional-managerial and of the unskilled blue-collar groups. In order to check the contemporary public definitions of 'the intellectual', a control sample of faculty members in the university would provide an in-group viewpoint. The control group will be discussed later in Chapter III.

The population for the research was defined as employable adults resident in single-family dwelling units in the city of Edmonton in the fall of 1964. "Employable" is used to indicate that adult respondents beyond school-age were required, although they were not necessarily the heads of households. Male or female residents older than the provincial voting age of 18 years were designated, with only one respondent per household.

Locale: The Flats and The Heights

Two census tract areas--one high in incomes, years of education, occupation types, value and condition of dwellings, the other low on these variables--were selected from the 1961 Census of Canada series on "Population and Housing Characteristics by Census Tracts" for Edmonton.² The difference in their socio-economic worlds is indicated by their topographical positions along the river, which hereafter labels them as The Heights and The Flats. Both are areas of permanent family

residence, which should have made them familiar with the campus-city controversy of 1963, and which made their citizens more accessible for interviewing than the transient Downtown area. Their characteristics on the occupational criterion mentioned above were appropriate, as the following discussion will reveal.

The Heights was a very young district in 1961, and by 1964-65 its population had grown, with considerable building still in progress. According to the 1961 census, the Heights was the highest ranking tract of single-family-dwelling units, in terms of a combination of factors such as average rent, median value of homes, household size, income, etc. For some of these factors, the area close to the University ranked higher, but it was excluded from the sample because of bias that might accrue in a study of images of intellectuals.³ The Heights represents the highest prestige neighbourhood of the city: lovely new homes placed to maximize the vista across the river. The median value of owner-occupied homes of \$20,749, in 1961 must surely have been surpassed by 1964 when newly-built homes costing \$80,000 were in evidence. In 1961 the mean wage-and-salary-income per family was \$8,405, and the mean for Edmonton generally was \$5,360.

The Flats was a run-down district in 1964-65, with very few new homes, and three-to-four room frame or stucco bungalows. The bends in the river made certain neighborhoods rather isolated, and along some of the roads which wound along the riverbank were unobtrusive clapboard shacks. Most of the Flats' residents, however, lived along unpaved streets lit by elderly, wide-spaced street-lights. Unkempt yards, occasionally full of machinery or auto parts, creaking gates and drawn window blinds gave the Flats the air of a district that had seen better

days a long time ago. In fact, in the Flats, 515 dwellings were in need of major repair in 1961, whereas in the Heights there are none in this state. The Flats and the Downtown Transient Area near city center are the only census tracts with more than a thousand dwellings dating earlier than 1920, and more Flats dwellings need repair than Downtown residences. It is no surprise that the Flats had the second-lowest wage-and-salary incomes in the city, a high unemployment ratio among employable males, and the lowest median value of dwellings in the city; \$9,920 compared to the Heights figure of \$20,749, and the Edmonton median of \$14,692.

The nature of the Heights as compared to Edmonton and to the Flats in census figures cannot reveal its first-hand impact. Comments will be brief here, and the supportive statistics are to be found in Appendix I.

Edmonton is a middle-class city, and yet, two social worlds within the middle class are exemplified in The Flats and The Heights. Picture windows commanding a view of a paved street, overlooking the view of the river characterized the Heights, and contrastingly, window-blinds were shut on the Flats' view of broken tricycles rusting near the cinder sidewalk.

The interviewers found housewives in the Heights playing bridge, or ready to go curling in their matched ski togs. Housewives in the Flats wore stained aprons and harassed, suspicious looks--on their way to hang out the wash instead of to go curling. In the evenings, men in the Heights still wore their white shirts and ties, and men in the Flats their plaid shirts or undershirts. Occasionally in the Heights, a door would be opened by a cleaning woman in her apron, but never by a uniformed maid. Wealth in the Heights is not highly conspicuous, nor aristocratic and genteel. Edmonton hasn't the estates, chauffeured cars,

or shimmering chandeliers of Toronto. In all of Edmonton in 1961, only 1907 male wage-earners earned more than \$10,000.⁴ The average wage-and-salary income for Edmonton males (irregardless of their being heads of households) was \$4,062 in 1961. For the Heights it was \$7,000; for the Flats, employed males earned an average of \$2,820.

The upper middle class portrait of the Heights, and the lower middle class sketch of the Flats are rounded out by looking at the occupational distributions. Of the 1,376 employed males in the Heights in 1961, more than half were classed as either in 'managerial' or 'professional and technical' occupations. Only ten per cent of the 2,255 employed males in the Flats were so categorized.⁵ More males in the Heights were classed as managers than any other category, while in the Flats the concentration of males was in the 'craftsmen, production process, and related workers'. Professionals ranked second in the Heights for male occupations, whereas in the Flats, the second-highest grouping was 'service and recreation'. In the city of Edmonton in total, craftsmen and production workers were the largest category, and managers the second-largest classification of employed males; however, the numbers of craftsmen are double those of managers in the city distribution.

We now turn from the areas to the methods used for sampling them.

Sampling

The most recent maps of the Flats and the Heights as they were in 1964 were those used for depicting polling divisions for the 1963 civic election. Polling division boundaries were not directly comparable to the Census tracts, but since polling divisions were smaller than census tracts, and the electoral maps showed blocks and houses, it

was decided to sample using them. A random selection was made of one polling division among four in each area in which interviews would be conducted. Since 1964 population figures for Flats and Heights were not known to the researcher, the sample had to be based on the number of residences counted in each area.

Respondents were randomly selected in the following manner: a count was made of the residence-bearing blocks, and the number of houses on each block in each area. Numbers were assigned to all the houses, starting at the south-east corner of the block, and numbering clockwise. Because the total number of houses on each block was known, houses could be selected so that the area was evenly represented. Using a table of random numbers, fifty houses were selected in each area. If more respondents were to be used as alternates, these would come from a selection of another twenty houses from each area.

The original intention of a sample of 100 respondents had to be revised when it was discovered during pre-testing that the interview took about an hour, and that travelling time to either The Flats or The Heights was sufficient to permit no more than five interviews a day. A series of blizzards also interfered with winter interviewing during 1964-1965. The final sample numbered seventy, an estimated 12% of Flats households with 36 cases, and 15% of Heights households with 34 cases.

The procedure for substitution was as follows. In cases of no answer at the selected house, two call-backs were made. If there was still no answer, the second selection of random house-numbers was drawn upon to find a replacement on that block. In case of refusals, after considerable attempt to convince the prospect of the legitimacy of the

study, an alternate was selected on the same block. Nine persons refused to be interviewed, or to allow their spouse to be the subject: five from the Flats, four from the Heights. In the Flats, respondents were suspicious of door-to-door salesmen;⁶ in the Heights, the reasons for refusal were often preoccupation with re-decorating or with family involvement in a curling bonspiel.

As far as possible, the particular member of the household to be interviewed was determined by whichever adult was present or answered the door. When the sample appeared to be burgeoning with females because of afternoon interviewing, as many males as possible were interviewed in the evenings. Occasional problems arose when one person was being interviewed, and the spouse, or a teenager listened, sometimes joining in. It was stressed to them that one person's opinions only were wanted, but at times the other party made valuable contributions--such as reminding the respondent of other magazines read in their house, of the income category, their own years of education or foreign languages spoken, even of the make of car they owned. Coding and punching on all attitude items was restricted to the opinions of the respondent, though background information such as exemplified above was coded where useful, and a recorded opinion given by a spouse was identified as such on the interview schedule. In three cases, because respondents had other appointments, interviews had to be obtained in two sittings.

Procedures: The Interview Schedule

The data collection technique to be utilized was determined by the exploratory nature of the study, since it was not known what frames of reference respondents would utilize, or which questions would tap

their opinions. Considering how many probative questions would occur, it was decided to conduct personal interviews rather than mailed questionnaires.⁷ Of the seventy interviews, all but two were conducted by the researcher, which minimized the bias of multiple interviewer styles and personalities.⁸

An interview schedule was designed, which consisted of social and cultural background data, and a variety of open-ended questions about "the intellectual". The first pretest, to refine and eliminate questions, was conducted as a questionnaire, with a University summer class. Fifty people, mostly teachers, listened to the researcher's introduction, then filled out the questionnaire, asking questions where necessary. For some questions, the tally showed that the "No Answer" rated was 80%. If a mailed questionnaire had been used in the major study, huge numbers would have had to be sent in order to receive meaningful quantity of responses. Another pretest was concerned solely with the wording and ordering of the intellectual questions, and used a sample of freshmen students.⁹ An area-stratification scheme was adopted, and a final pretest of 10 interviews established that the length of interviews would be about an hour, and that a letter of introduction would be necessary to convince respondents of authenticity. Driving-time from campus necessitating the areas be sampled consecutively.

Questions were arranged so that items dealing with preferences and interests were interspersed with socio-economic items, with the intellectual questions at the end. The final interview schedule is found in Appendix II. Most of the questions about 'the intellectual' are open-ended, which allowed maximum expression of frames of reference,

though it prolonged the interview as respondents thought and answered at length. Certainly, vagueness is the price paid here for variety. It is a limitation of this study that forced-choice questions were not used to a greater extent with the intellectual variables.

Although respondents knew that the project concerned "Interests and Opinions", they were not told in advance of the section on intellectuals. Thus, genuine first reactions were recorded.¹⁰ Generally, despite the frustrations some respondents felt throughout the questions asking them to discuss such a mythical beast as an intellectual, good rapport was established between interviewer and respondent.

The interviewer read all questions to the respondent, and did all the writing. Students of interviewing, such as Cannell and Axelrod,¹¹ have found that respondents are occasionally hesitant to divulge income information. In order to ensure few "No Answers" in this study, the interviewers handed respondents a card with income categories on it, then another card and an envelope, so that respondents wrote down the appropriate category in relative secrecy. A similar arrangement was used for political party preference, though most respondents were quite willing to proclaim their affiliation to the interviewer.

The socio-economic questions which became components of the Social Class Score will be discussed in the following chapter, which will discuss the formulation of all indices. Supplementary questions were also asked, such as the education level of the spouse, the former occupations of the retired, the respondent's ideal job, etc. Membership and leadership positions in organizations, religious activity, interest in sports and hobbies, ownership and favorites in automobiles--even liquor preferences were asked. As the potential complexity of the

study became more apparent to the researcher, analysis of items of questionable relevance was dropped from present consideration. "Interest" items have been restricted to mass media involvement.

The crucial aspects of a definition of an intellectual, central to the thesis, revolve around the first question: "what does the label, an intellectual, bring first to your mind?" Subsequent questions on status, roles and goals of intellectuals, and several designed to probe respondents' attitudes toward men of ideas, augment the data relating to the image of the intellectual.

Analysis of Data

Categorization of the frames of reference used in defining the intellectual evolved from the actual data, and were not established earlier by the researcher. Predictions of frames of reference might have been made a priori, knowing the historical literature about intellectuals, but an empirical plunge into the colloquial description of the social type had not heretofore been undertaken. Only when conceptual limits are not confined can a respondent express frames of reference particularly pertinent to him at that time.¹²

The categorization procedure is illustrated with the classification of the first 'definite question' which asked what the intellectual label brought to mind. A tabulation was made of all seventy replies to the question, and the following set of responses emerged:

- a. 'knowledgeability': cleverness, intelligence, a high level of education and scholarship;
- b. 'brainworker': anyone who works at mental work, uses mind, 'thinks a lot';
- c. introverted interests: 'bookworm', studious sort, researcher, fond of reading, improving mind;
- d. extroverted interests: helper, advisor, 'expert', world affairs leader, critic;

- e. power and status: 'top dog', elite, authority, 'snob', 'important man';
- f. irrelevant and unclassifiable: 'decent fellow', morally good person, unobtrusive, 'top sportsman';
- g. don't know.

Because of the diversity of individual responses, and vocabularies--54 of the seventy mentioned 'knowledge' but in different contexts--it was impossible to use a simple dichotomous classification, such as 'ascribed-achieved' or 'role-status' viewpoints. An analyst less interested in the kinds of categories of thought used might have classified responses as 'admiring-vs.-anti-intellectual'. However, the formulation used here is:

- a. ascribed personal qualities, particularly intelligence;
- b. goals and value of ideas inferred from life-interests;
- c. achieved personal characteristics
 - i. level of education or expertise; wide knowledge;
 - ii. economic status, presumed elite membership.

Hence, the responses were classed in terms of 'intelligence', or 'scholarly interests', or 'wide knowledge' or 'status'-- and a 'don't know' category.

Extensive analytical use is made of the first question on intellectuals because it was felt that as the interview proceeded respondents built on previous answers, and a "halo effect" could have easily occurred due to question order.¹³ The particular example of this is related to data on occupations of intellectuals. The first question which brought this up asked respondents to choose among fourteen alphabetically listed occupations those which might be 'mostly intellectual careers'.¹⁴ The interviewer recorded selections in the order mentioned by the respondent as he read from a card. Not only was this an arbitrary list of mostly professional careers--classifiable into arts, business and public life, academic and scientific, and

standard helping-professions--but it obviated the effect of a subsequent question asking how intellectuals in Canada are employed. Certainly, a reversal of the order of these questions would have expanded the employment categories perceived as appropriate to intellectuals, since respondents merely referred to the list.

While the fourteen suggested careers of intellectuals hindered the frames of reference used for occupation, in one instance channeling of responses aided the analysis. The word 'goals' has so many possible interpretations that it was decided to list alternate goals when asking respondents about what intellectuals are working toward. After the question, the interviewer read: 'Money? Fame? Knowledge? Humanity's future?' Although it may be that the last alternative mentioned gets more than its share of responses in a list read aloud, the alternatives seemed to separate out those who view the intellectual in status terms, from those who see him pursuing personal fulfillment.¹⁵

The weakest set of items pertaining to the intellectual appear to be those purporting to measure anti-intellectualism. The concept had never before been operationalized, and so there were no known attitude-tapping questions to measure negative predispositions toward intellectuals.¹⁶ It was not known which items would clearly distribute the respondents, but questions were asked nonetheless.

Instead of grouping the negative attitude items into a so-called 'anti-intellectualism score', which was experimented with during data analysis, attitude items are treated separately. Some were asked in a way which did not distribute the responses, as for example the question which asked "are all intellectuals atheists, not believing in a god or church?" Sixty per cent of the respondents answered in the negative,

and it was not readily known what atheism meant to the rest. Some questions were asked in a double-barrelled way, for instance subjects were enabled to discuss kinds of intellectuals they 'respect' and those they 'disrespect', and to explain what kinds they consider 'phony' and 'real', and to express which traits they consider 'good' and 'bad' about intellectuals. However, proportions of respondents answered one facet of such questions as these, without mentioning the other aspect. The interviewer was unable to probe extensively, without biasing the schedule by introducing extra questions.

As the theoretical chapter has discussed, we must be content with an indirect measure of the difficult and complex concept 'anti-intellectualism'.¹⁷ We assume that those respondents who would restrict the freedom of certain types of teachers from access to the classroom might also distrust other intellectual types, that those who would disapprove of the function of intellectuals as societal critics would prevent them from carrying out a traditional role. Because ambivalence implies respect as well as distrust, indicators are problematic.

The content analysis phase of the data interpretation was followed by cross-tabulating many of the variables. This involved use of the IBM 7040 computer on the Edmonton campus, and later the IBM 7094 computer through The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. Variables dealing with the research questions were punched onto data cards, and a non-parametric program was used. No computer program was available which contained in one package all the statistics useful to a study which includes both ordinal and nominal variables.¹⁸ As will be discussed in more detail in the Scoring chapter to follow, some of

the ordinal statistics did show that scales had not been built. Component scale items were cross-tabulated with total scores, in order to show which components were strong contributors and which were weak.

For the intellectual variables, the Chi-square statistic for tests of significance was applicable. The many frames of reference used by respondents in the questions on "the intellectual" meant that no single dimension existed for these, and certainly no rank could be imputed to such different replies as "intellectuals are highly educated" and "intellectuals are top dogs". Differences existed, and the extent of the differences could be measured with a nominal statistic--but no direction or distance between categories could be assumed for these questions, and Chi-square was chosen as the most useful and appropriate measure. In this exploratory study, the main purpose in the analysis of the intellectual variables was to pick out the conceptual dimensions in the content of the responses, and to build from there some basis for future hypotheses.

Checks and Controls

Although an exploratory study such as this must wait for further research to test the reliability and validity of its findings,¹⁹ two checks were included in this research. Before the cultural interests of respondents were restricted to mass media items, a panel of judges was asked to rank titles, programs, etc., to provide the researcher with their distribution as High Culture, Middle or Low Culture. Further, seventeen members of the University of Alberta faculty were interviewed to sample the academic view of the intellectual. The implications of these data as checks on measurements in this study will be discussed in turn.

Prior to actual interviewing, a panel of judges ranked over 300 items dealing with their cultural rank. The fourteen independent judges, ranged in age from 20 to 55, and included eight males and six females. These judges separately read a description of High, Middle and Low Culture Ranking, then sorted item-cards into appropriate piles.²⁰ They included two Arts undergraduates, two Arts graduate students, two radio announcers, two university professors, two housewives, one newspaperman, one nurse, one schoolteacher, and one farmer-turned-businessman. The only basis for selection was that these people all participated in a variety of leisure sub-cultures, and were known to the researcher to be interested in a culture ranking experiment. None knew the selections of the others, as the item-cards were always re-sorted into alphabetical order by type. Magazines, pictorial artists, cars, composers, novelists and movie titles constituted the 318 items. The following chapter will show only the magazines, artists, composers and novelists were used when interests were reduced to media involvements.

Interviews with faculty members were obtained to have a control group against which to judge the area respondents' views. In this way familiarity with the intellectual-type could be judged by 'in-group'²¹ and 'out-group' samples. The academics were seventeen purposively selected men, considered by graduate students to be among the intellectuals in their own departments. Before their interviews, in an introductory letter, they were told considerably more about the topic of the research than were other respondents.

Thus, while the panel of judges helped show whether there were agreed-upon standards to validate the categorizing of media items into

quality levels, the academic sample helped show whether the public area samples' views of the intellectual were really any different from the professors' views. The interviews with supposed intellectuals provide a sounding-board on which to test the tone of the responses of the public.

Summary

In summary, this chapter has dealt with the characteristics of the two areas sampled in Edmonton: the Heights, an upper-middle-class new neighborhood, and the Flats, a lower-middle-class rundown district.

The sampling procedure, utilizing a table of random numbers, and resulting in seventy interviews was outlined. Pretests showed that a questionnaire method would yield inadequate data, so personal interviews were conducted.

The interview schedule included socio-economic questions, interest and preference data including the mass media, and open-ended questions on the image of the intellectual.

The analysis procedure was highlighted, with most emphasis on the content analysis of the intellectual questions. A non-parametric computer program aided in the selection of weak items, and in the scoring of ordinal items, which will be extensively discussed in the coming chapter. The Chi-square test of significance was used with the nominal variables, including those involving the intellectual.

The validity of the data of an exploratory study is difficult to assess. Two measurement checks included the ranking of media and interest items by fourteen independent judges, and a control series of interviews with seventeen supposedly intellectual academics.

A detailed discussion of the ordinal measures will precede Data Analysis.

FOOTNOTES CHAPTER III

1. De facto segregation means "the concentration of population types within a community", in particular the homogeneity of economic levels, according to P.D. McKenzie, "The Scope of Human Ecology" in George Theodorson, ed., Studies in Human Ecology (Evanston: Row, Peterson & Company, 1961), p. 35. In simple terms, people choose to live near others who are similar to themselves. Otis D. and Beverly Duncan have studied census - tract homogeneity, and constructed an "index of segregation" between any occupation group and all other occupations for any given area within a city: "Residential Distribution and Occupational Stratification" in Theodorson, pp. 155-157.
2. Canada, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1961 Census of Canada. Population and housing characteristics by census tracts: Edmonton, Bulletin CT - 21. The definitions of the Census for such indicators as dwelling units, wage-earners, etc. have been used throughout this Chapter. Occupation and income categories were grouped, as is discussed shortly.
3. It was decided to restrict the main sample to supposedly non-intellectual citizens, and to bring in the academic world only for the control sample of faculty members. However, since the Downtown Slum was by-passed too, because of its transient rooming-house population and its interviewing difficulties, the second bias is equalized. The Flats is second-lowest and the Heights second-highest on some indicators, as will be discussed in Appendix I.
4. The Census' upper income category in 1961 was \$10,000 and over, which in the cities even in 1964 was not high enough to distinguish the highest income groups. In 1961, the 1907 men earning over \$10,000 in Edmonton were just 2.7% of the total wage-earners. That year 4.1% of male wage-earners in Toronto earned over \$10,000.
5. Again, these occupational categories are based on the definitions given by Census Bulletin CT - 21, op. cit.
6. A high-pressure group of magazine salesmen had apparently canvassed the Flats in early autumn, using the university's name, so that many prospective respondents were reluctant to be interviewed. A letter of authority was produced in such cases to prove legitimacy.
7. Comparison of questionnaire and interview techniques is made in Chapter Seven of Claire Sellitz, et. al., Research Methods in Social Relations, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Revised One-Volume Edition, 1964). Since the questionnaire is "appropriate only for subjects with a considerable amount of education. . . few have the patience or motivation to write as fully as they might speak", (p. 24) it appeared better to use the interview to explore the low-interest subject of the image of intellectuals. "Its flexibility makes the interview a far superior technique for the exploration of

areas where there is little basis for knowing either what questions to ask or how to formulate them." (p. 242).

8. All the interviews were conducted by females, about the same age as the researcher, and also university students. Biases and styles of interviews are discussed in Chapter 12 of S.A. Richardson, B.S. Dohernwend, D. Klein, Interviewing: Its Forms and Functions (New York, Basic Books, Inc., 1965).
9. No major problems arose with the interest of these students in the topic, which may have misled the researcher to thinking that the average respondent elsewhere shared an interest in "the Intellectual".
10. The interview schedule shows that the topic was carefully introduced to imply that respondents would have a meaning for "intellectual", but not so that they could utilize a definition given by the researcher.
11. Charles Cannell and Morris Axelrod, "The Respondent Reports on the Interview", AJS, Vol. 62, (1956), pp. 177-181.
12. Richardson, et. al., op. cit., pp. 45-51; Sellitz, et. al., op. cit., pp. 391-401.
13. Sellitz et. al., illustrate the systematic error called "halo effect" by saying "If more than one characteristic of a person is to be judged, raters frequently carry over a generalized impression of the person from one rating to the next, or they try to make their ratings consistent." (p. 351). This is an inescapable result in a study of one social type where all questions relating to "the Intellectual" occur together.
14. The alphabetic listing of the careers was the only arbitrary arrangement which would not indicate to respondents a ranking of "correct" careers. Since the frequently chosen occupations happen to begin with letters near the end of the alphabet, it would seem that respondents' choices were not overly influenced by word order.
15. Chapter II has discussed the evidence that a major societal goal involves improving the human condition, so the emphasis on "humanity's future" is to be expected despite its placement in the set of alternatives.
16. Chapters I and II have introduced this topic as complex and never before operationalized in an empirical study of a sociological nature, cf. pp. 9 and 56.
17. Direct measure awaits the assembly of studies more complex than this one, which introduce attitude indices about the intellectual which as yet are not known.

18. Discrepancies occurred between programs: the data processed in Edmonton could be analyzed with Gamma, but that statistic was not in the Toronto program. The ordinal measures of association used to rank order Flats and Heights respondents were the Mann-Whitney U test and the Kruskal-Wallis test, which were included in the 7094's non-parametric package. Reference was made to S. Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956), pp. 140-150.
19. Reliability is treated by Abraham Kaplan as one of the components of validity when he argues that to find out what a measurement "is able to accomplish" or whether it is "measuring what it purports to measure", you need to know whether the same measure will remain constant with conditions - which is reliability. A. Kaplan, The Conduct of Inquiry (San Francisco: The Chandler Publishing Co., 1964), pp. 198-204. Kaplan makes a criticism appropriate to this research against "false precision" - an "exact count of a class which is only vaguely specified". (p. 204).
20. In each case, the researcher was present to answer questions about the procedure. Some judges desired five categories instead of three, these were permitted for difficult discriminations.
21. A decision had to be made whether the Academic sub-group would be large, and a sample of the university community, or a control group of a small number of intellectual professors. The latter was decided upon, and therefore the seventeen professors were selected purposively for their intellectual fame, not randomly by faculty.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY II : ITEMS AND SCORES

We can find in class societies a wide range of differences in behavior between the classes, from general demographic characteristics such as length of life and size of family, to kinds of entertainment, voting habits, and reading habits. . . Underlying class differences in behavior are differences in attitudes and values. Social class is a milieu within which one lives and from which one takes ones cues in almost all aspects of behavior. .

- John Porter in
The Vertical Mosaic

In order to differentiate the milieux, or social worlds, which would characterize respondents of different social classes, some measures of class position, amounts and levels of exposure to mass media, and attitudes toward intellectuals had to be devised. This chapter deals with the scores which were constructed, with their component items, and the analysis procedure by which item strength was determined. Specifically, indices were constructed to measure social class, media exposure, and media quality.

When a concept, such as social class, is operationalized to be measured by particular indicators with particular cutting points, it changes from its abstract, theoretical form. Blalock argues that this change is important enough to result in a second concept;

We have used a terminology which seems to imply that there are two distinct ways of defining the 'same' concept, whereas Northrup chooses to refer to two different kinds of concepts. Others prefer to think in terms of indices rather than operational definitions. The concept index usually implies that the procedure used gives only an imperfect indicator of some underlying variable which is not directly measurable. According to this perspective, then, there is both an underlying variable and an indicator of this variable. . .

In order to avoid confusion it is important to realize that the actual test is made in terms of the concepts as operationally defined. Propositions involving concepts defined theoretically are therefore not directly testable.¹

In research of an exploratory nature, when few guidelines exist for the operationalizing of such concepts as "media quality", it is essential to detail the procedure. First we will outline the indicators of social class, which combined for a "Social Class Score".

Indices of Independent Variables

Social Class Score

The measures of socio-economic position include the common status hierarchies of education, income, occupation, and neighborhood. These indicators were summed to yield a possible score total of sixteen points:

Family income.....possible	4
Years of education.....possible	3
Occupation.....possible	7
Residential area.....possible	2
total possible	16

The weighting of these variables will be briefly discussed here, and then each will be dealt with in detail.

Chapter III reported some of the socio-economic differences which existed in Edmonton's neighborhoods we call the "Flats" and the "Heights". In order to index those differences, which together make up the untestable variations in "social class",² we included the four component items most often used to indicate that underlying concept.

Occupation is the most heavily-weighted item of the Social Class Score, for two reasons. It has repeatedly shown itself to be the most important single variable in objective rankings of status.³ In a city such as Edmonton, without extremes of aristocratic wealth and hard-core

poverty, occupation may operate as the basis for reputational status-ranking more than income. Additionally, the Canadian classification system for occupation which is used in this study, is separated into seven classes.⁴ Further discussion will be made shortly.

Income was combined for husband and wife, to yield 'family income' per year, which is our second Social Class indicator. Four categories were made in order to separate the poor from the average earners, and the wealthy from the above-average earners. (Tables showing the distribution of respondents in each income category, and showing all item-to-score contributions are found in Appendix IV). The poor, or Low income category, contained the average wage-and-salary income for the "Flats". The average, or Low Middle income category contained the 1961 average for Edmonton as a whole; the above-average, or High Middle income category contained the average wage-and-salary income for the "Heights". A wealthy or High category was included so that those professional and managerial citizens with incomes over \$13,000 would be set apart more clearly.⁵

Education contributes a possible three points to the Social Class Score, separating the categories of public school, high school, and university education. Years of education for the respondent is used, since the individual's own background would be more relevant to his opinions than a combined score with his spouse. Years of education took account of type of education. Legally the minimum Alberta age for leaving school is Grade 8, and for Europeans and other Canadian provinces that is the end of public school. The middle category of nine to twelve years constituted the junior matriculating year, and high school. The upper category of thirteen years and over, included all

higher education whether university or technical training beyond high school.

Area of residence was weighted as one or two points--for "Flats" or "Heights". Since the two areas had been selected from the Census on the basis of their socio-economic disparity, neighborhood already included a ranking by income, occupation, etc. To weight the variable heavily, and include separate contributions by its components, would be repetitive, and would 'stack the cards'. At most, area of residence would be a confirmation of the other status indicators, so it was awarded only two points.

We have outlined the reasons for the item-contributions of the Social Class Score, and tables showing each variable cross-tabulated with the total score are found in the Appendix. We shall now discuss the precise cutting points for each item, then for the total score.

Family income was measured in categories of fifteen-hundred-dollars in order to avoid asking respondents directly for their annual income figures. Using this indirect technique, response levels were good, and only two refused to divulge their incomes.⁶ Table IV - 1 shows the total response, and Table IV - 2 shows the collapsed form in four sub-groupings.

The final categories used for analysis were discussed above, and were cut as follows:

Low.....	\$0. to \$ 4,499.	(n=22)	1 point
Low Mid.....	\$4,500. to \$ 5,999.	(n=10)	2 points
High Mid....	\$6,000. to \$12,999.	(n=23)	3 points
High.....	\$13,000. & over	(n=14)	4 points

Though unequal, these categories group the data from the fifteen-hundred-dollar groupings as well as possible, while separating the averages discussed above.

Education has been introduced above, and constituted three categories of years of education of the respondent. The actual categories are as follows:

Low.....	under 9 years.	(n=14)	1 point
Middle.....	9 to 12 years.	(n=33)	2 points
High.....	13 years & over.	(n=23)	3 points

Education data was collected for both respondents and spouses, and it was decided to include only the respondent's education as relevant to the Social Class Score. Although it might be debated that both members of a couple contribute to their social class, and ought to be considered for all status components, education is not pooled as is income. Education is a more individual status-attaining variable, and in the context of this research, the respondent's replies might be better considered against his or her own educational achievement. However, most spouses had gained the same level of schooling as our interviewee, as is evident from a comparison of Tables IV - 3 and IV - 4. Differences are due to those female respondents who had attained grade school, while their husbands had gone as far as high school, so that one spouse is Middle or even High, and the other is Low. Further reference to education levels will be made in Chapter VI when it will be compared to several dependent variables.

Categorized in this way, the extreme cases of people low and high in education are clearly defined. If the variable had been cut so that Grade 9 fell in the Low group, a more equalized distribution would have resulted. Since it is the total Social Class Score which is more important in cross-tabulations, the differentiation of clearly low, middle and high respondents should allow the extreme cases to receive few or many points in the total score.⁷

Occupation was described above as a very important variable. It could also be argued that the investigation of the public image of the intellectual makes occupational contacts a key variable. Social types may be encountered in patterns which reflect one's working world and occupational associates. The seven points for occupation reflect a weighting for the seven occupational classes devised by Bernard R. Blishen for Canadian data.⁸ In the four cases where a male respondent had retired, the former occupation was obtained and points awarded for it. The categories were:

Class 7	Housewife or Laborers, etc.	(n= 7)	1 point
Class 6	Semi-skilled blue collar	(n= 7)	2 points
Class 5	Skilled blue, unskilled white	(n=16)	3 points
Class 4	Foremen, office clerks, etc.	(n= 6)	4 points
Class 3	Semi-professional white collar	(n= 7)	5 points
Class 2	Professional, managerial	(n=18)	6 points
Class 1	Top-level professions	(n= 9)	7 points

The occupation of the male breadwinner was considered more important than restricting ourselves to the respondent in each case. The job of housewife was, incidentally, ranked at 1 point.⁹ In ranking social class positions informally, women are usually asked their husband's occupation, whether or not they are working themselves. Obviously, the prestige accorded to occupation makes us treat this variable as pooled for a couple instead of important for each individual.¹⁰ If our respondent was the housewife, and her husband was a physician, the occupational score would be 7 for a professional, not 1 for a housewife.

Blishen's seven occupational classes were based on occupations listed in the 1951 Census of Canada, and for that reason, recent technological occupations are not well-represented, and possibilities exist that the class divisions do not represent current prestige-rankings. Blishen states that the class intervals are unequal in order to separate

occupations of low and high prestige: "The investigator's awareness of the relative prestige ranking of occupations was a major factor in the classification".¹¹ Precise positions of occupations on Blishen's scale were obtained from combined standard scores of average income and average number of years of schooling of persons known to the D.B.S. to occupy those occupations. For our purposes, however, occupational scores were based on the points assigned to the category, so that the Social Class Score later could account for income and education.

Points were assigned to the classes in reverse to Blishen's numbering, that is, a janitor found in Class 7 of the Blishen scale, would receive 1 point; and a dentist, categorized in Class 1, would receive 7 points. For discussion, Classes 1 and 2 are grouped together as Managerial-Professional, Classes 3, 4, and a few 5 are grouped as White Collar, and most of Classes 5, 6, and 7 are shown as Blue Collar. Data was tabulated for both sexes, but discussion centers on male occupations, since occupations of wives are insignificant determinants of socio-economic status in comparison with occupations of husbands. Table IV - 5 in the Appendix shows the fit of occupational categories with the Social Class Score.

Area remains, as the other indicator of social class which was included in the Social Class Score. As the previous chapter has pointed out, the Heights was clearly an upper-middle-class neighborhood of new, costly homes; and the Flats was a run-down lower-middle-class neighborhood of elderly, inexpensive dwellings. Therefore, on the basis of the reputational significance that areas of a city acquire by the types of residents they attract, area itself can be a class indicator. The evidence is clear that this de facto segregation operates in the Flats

and Heights, as Table IV - 6 shows the fit between Area and the Social Class Score. The respondents who are status-inconsistent in residence are indicated: the factory-managers are the only wealthy family sampled in the Flats, while no families of Low Social Class are trying to keep up with the Joneses in the Heights. Area could be considered an indicator of the purchasing power of the respondent; Chapter III and its Appendix have shown the disparate values of dwellings in the two neighborhoods.

The Social Class Score, in summary, consisted of a summation of points for occupation, education, income and area of residence. The number of points which constituted the summed Social Class Score for each respondent ranged from four to sixteen, with 4 respondents scoring the minimum, and 5 respondents totalling the maximum score.¹² In order to be useful as an independent variable which could differentiate respondents of varying interests and opinions, the scores were cut into Low, Middle and High. Points were grouped as follows:

Low.....	4 to 8 points	(n=28)	40%
Middle...	9 to 12 points	(n=16)	22.9%
High.....	13 to 16 points	(n=26)	37.1%

There is a close distribution of points when the Score is cut this way, five points in the Low category, four in the Middle group, and four in the High category. It was an arbitrary decision, based on the way that respondents in the sample accumulated score points. If the total range of Social Class Scores is examined by area, for overlap of scores, then a 'purer' distribution would result. There are only overlaps between Flats and Heights residents between scores 10 and 13. It would look this way:

Low.....	4 to 9 points	(n=31)	Flats only
Middle...	10 to 13 points	(n=19)	Flats & Heights
High.....	14 to 16 points	(n=20)	Heights only

However for purposes of tabulation with other variables, this distribution is certainly lop-sided in cell-concentration. It was decided to utilize the grouping which polarized the scores fairly well, so that there are only two less respondents in the High group than the Low group. It is this ranking which is utilized in the analysis of data on the intellectual, as the independent variable for social class.

Indices of Dependent Variables

In terms of their relation with the Social Class Score, all the other scores to be treated in this thesis are used as Dependent variables. We have argued that social class is an indicator of social world which is the underlying Independent variable we will use for this examination of the image of the intellectual, the Dependent variable. When compared to items measuring the cognitive and attitudinal structure in respondents' conceptions of 'the intellectual', all other variables are Independent. In particular, we consider the two measures of amount of exposure and quality-levels of the mass media in this way. Media Exposure is dependent upon social class, as is Media Quality, but they are each independent regarding the image and attitudes toward the intellectual.

It is also possible--but too rarely done--to treat a variable as independent in one study and dependent in another study. We could even give a variable this dual role in the same study. In other words, the independent and dependent variable classification is really a classification of uses of variables rather than a distinction between different kinds of variables.¹³

Kerlinger's point on the uses of variables exemplifies the interplay of variables in this study. Chapter VI will present the tabulations which show the associations between Social Class Scores, Media Exposure Scores, and Medians of Quality Scores, and intellectual items, including the Anti-Intellectualism Score.

Let us consider the components of the Media Exposure Score.

Mass Media Exposure

As has been discussed in earlier chapters, not only are there an ever-growing number of informative and entertaining messages available to members of Canadian society, but their packaging, timing, level of appeal, and other factors make them of varied interest to the citizens. When we consider the amount of exposure that a respondent may have to written and broadcast media of communication, we include kind and quality as well as number. An index of exposure to the media may be composed of several factors, from a wide variety of media: television programs, magazines, books, types of musical compositions, and types of radio stations and programs, motion pictures and newspapers. The two last-named media, movies and newspapers, were dropped from the current study, because of the problems of classifying the kind and quality of their content.¹⁴

There is some evidence, discussed in Chapter II, that American social classes are exposed to different types of media, in different amounts.¹⁵ The lower class there read less, watch more television, and listen to more radio programs than the middle class; we should anticipate differences in exposure of our two area groups. Such a question required an exposure index that would show what range of exposure existed in the participants of various media. This was constructed on the basis of the data collected, as follows.

Television was watched by all seventy respondents, which was the only medium without a zero-response residue. Since respondents were asked to name their favorite TV shows, some bias might be introduced by

the fluent middle-class having a better 'media recall' than less articulate or retentive respondents. However, it might be argued that someone who really does enjoy a program, and watches it regularly, knows its name when asked.

The highest number of television programs listed by a single respondent was nine, the next highest six. Occasionally, a category of television shows had to be counted as a program if the respondent could not think of specific titles, but knew he liked 'westerns' or 'espionage' shows.¹⁶ Usually, however, the exposure scoring was simply one title, one point.

Respondents read regularly a wide range of numbers of magazines. The number of magazines read seems to be a clear indicator of the socio-economic status of respondents. Data on periodicals was obtained by asking subjects to name magazines they read regularly, by subscribing, purchasing, or borrowing. Of the eleven who read no magazines, nine were Flats residents, and some of these respondents stated that they could not afford magazines. Four Heights respondents had very high exposure to magazines: one named thirteen read regularly by the adults, another listed eleven, and two named ten magazines. Again, scoring was based on one title, one point. Professional journals of a technical nature were not included, but semi-popular trade or professional magazines,¹⁷ such as Oral Health and Beaver were included. Children's magazines were not included unless the respondent said that he or she read them personally. The only one of the newspaper weekly magazines which was included was The Star Weekly, because it is sold apart from the newspaper, as a magazine. Other comments on the kinds of magazines mentioned by respondents will be made later in this chapter, in discussing media quality.

Books were the hardest entertainment or media item to recall, perhaps because the question was phrased for respondents to list books they had read and enjoyed, and some they had disliked. Titles were difficult to recall, so sometimes a category had to be counted as a book: 'Ellery Queen mysteries', or 'books on early America, especially New Orleans'. If an author was given, it was still counted as one book: 'anything by Agatha Christie'.

Even then, 23 could recall no book titles, or said they didn't read complete books, which means 32.9% were unexposed to this medium of ideas. One person listed five books, and seven could think of four titles each, but obviously, there was scant reading of books among sample members.¹⁸

Some measure of the respondent's interest in music was thought desirable to represent auditory as well as visual media. Perhaps because the question was worded so that the respondent listed the type of music he enjoyed most, those with no interest were discouraged from stating their indifference. At any rate, everyone stated a preference, sometimes in the most general terms, such as 'some heavy music, but not gobs of opera', or 'old pops, 20-year favorites'. Two respondents each mentioned five distinct items, while four people listed four types of music. "Types" was loosely interpreted by both respondent and coder: from a composer's name, to a musical genre like 'jazz', each was worth one point of media exposure.

Exposure to radio was measured by asking which radio station the respondent preferred. Surprisingly, of the eight who expressed no interest in, or preference for radio-listening, five were residents of the Heights. One of these is the television watcher who led the list with nine favorite

programs! Usually respondents merely gave the call letters of the station they preferred, but a few mentioned particular stations for special services or program-features. There were only eight local and district radio stations so that the potential range of exposure is clearly defined for Edmontonians. The quality distribution of radio-listening is more useful than the fact that all but eight of the respondents named a preferred station. A fault of the questionnaire was the lack of probing into the types of exposure to radio--whether it was merely a news-weather-and sports information service, or not.

An index of exposure to all these media was made by summing the actual numbers of items reported. Exposure points were added up so that a grand total of items could be known for each respondent. The range of exposure to the five media mentioned above was 3 points to 22 points, with a mid-point of 10, and a mean of 9.25 items.

The total number of items by media is as follows, revealing that the magazines alone provide one-third of the exposure, while radio stations named are just over one for each respondent:

Television	174 items	(23.9%)
Magazines	248 items	(34.1%)
Books	97 items	(13.3%)
Music	131 items	(18.0%)
Radio	77 items	(10.6%)

To convert total exposure numbers into rank categories, cutting points had to be established between 3 and 22. A trial run was made with four categories: low, low-middle, high-middle, and high,¹⁹ after which it was decided to use a three-way distribution: Low, Middle and High. Cutting points were made to equalize the distribution so that a sufficient number of cases would appear to show traits of the low-exposed, middle-exposed, and high-exposed in cross-tabulations. Media Exposure Scores

were ranked thus:

Low.....	3 to 8 points	(n=22)
Middle....	9 to 11 points	(n=24)
High.....	12 to 22 points	(n=24)

Eight respondents have little or no exposure to several of the media, and might be called under-exposed to cultural communications. Four respondents are distinctly high in multiple exposure, and might be called over-exposed to mass media information.²⁰ We shall see in Chapter VI that the over-exposed are well-educated Heights dwellers, and the under-exposed are Flats dwellers of low Social Class Scores.

The fact that there are people so highly exposed as to watch television all evening every evening, and who also regularly read a half dozen magazines, serves to indicate that there are citizens continually being exposed to cultural socialization. What implications their exposure has for the public image of the intellectual is better understood in terms of the kinds, levels and qualities of their exposure.

Media Quality: The Panel of Judges

The theoretical chapter introduced the problem of ranking mass media material. The problem is pointed up by asking how the data are to be handled when faced with television-viewing respondents who watched a ballet on Festival, and those who watch a 'special' featuring Hank Snow. Obviously, these programs could be classed by type, both were musical presentations; but just as obviously, we will learn more about the respondents who viewed them if we class them by the quality of the message.²¹ How were scores given for media quality, then? Prior to construction of the interview schedule, a panel of independent judges provided a partial solution to the problem of quality-ranking.

The dimensions of leisure and entertainment which were used for

indicators of High Culture, Middle and Low Culture were confined to the mass media. Judges ranked magazines, pictorial artists, cars, composers, novelists and movie titles, but from this, only magazines, composers and novelists were used for this analysis.²² Knowledge of the title of a motion picture which might have been seen five years previous, could not be counted on among the judges. Until judging, it had been assumed that in the interview the respondents would be given, as the judges were, short lists of representative movies, magazines, composers and authors, to check off their preferences. But when the judges overwhelmingly did not know how to rank movies, and had difficulty in placing such famous pictures as Citizen Kane, The Magnificent Seven and Lilies of the Field, it was concluded that movies had such low recall and sometimes so many quality-levels in the same film, and thus responses to that medium would be uncodable. Titles would be elicited from respondents for all media items, instead of attempting to present a check-list of well-known and representative items.

Since Dwight Macdonald and Russell Lynes' conceptualization of high, middle and low culture was to be used, each judge was given instructions which described these categories. After he had read and understood the postulated levels, he proceeded to place each item into the pile which seemed most appropriate to him. The instructions are to be found in Appendix III in the same form they were given to the judges. Cases which the judge could not place in "High", "Middle" or "Low" piles, could be placed in interstitial categories, or "Don't Know" or an "All levels" category. The judges were asked to use the interstitial piles of "Low-Middle" and "Middle-High" only when they perceived the item to fall between the three defined levels. We shall deal with the postulated

quality-levels in the next section of this chapter. Here, the procedures of the judges will be detailed.

After the initial sorting of items into card-piles of High, Middle, Low and so on, the judges were asked to go through each pile again to find outstanding items, those which they felt to be excellent examples of whichever level they were considering. From these tallies of item-cards, the first indications of consensus on cultural levelling occurred. After each judge had finished, the researcher recorded the classifications he had decided on, and returned the item-cards to alphabetical order. Generally considered to be excellent examples of "High" were: authors James Joyce, Kierkegaard, and Jean-Paul Sartre; magazines Partisan Review and Commentary; composers Schönberg and others.²³ Excellent examples of "Middle" were thought to be Herman Wouk, Vance Packard; Pedbook and Time magazines; composers George Gershwin, Beethoven Sibelius and Tchaikovsky. Excellent examples of "Low" were considered Zane Grey, Earle Stanley Gardiner and Frank Yerby; True Story and The Reader's Digest; and composers Johann Strauss, Fats Waller, Rodgers and Hammerstein. The selections of items which were excellent in terms of their culture-levels were also helpful in categorizing respondents' choices later. We shall turn to the assignment of points to the media items respondents named during the interview.

Media Quality: Scoring

Many of the judges found it necessary to use the interstitial categories of Low-Middle and Middle-High for rating the magazines. This raised the question of a five-point instead of a three-point system for attaching scores to each quality-level. Just as every item had had an exposure contribution, so should every item have a quality contribution.

It was decided that scoring low to high from one to five points would facilitate the fine discriminations useful for magazine and television-rating.

Before a close examination of the rankings for each of the media, we can summarize the general basis of ranking. "High" quality would receive five and four points. The avant-garde items, to receive five points, were to be innovative, intellectually challenging; serious examples of a genre's highest standard of output. We have seen that the judges considered Joyce and Sartre to belong to this category, as would most philosophers, composers of electronic music, sculptors using plastics and so on. In our data, it is understandably rare that preferences are stated for the avant-garde entertainment items, for concentration and mental exertion are needed in their appreciation.

Four points were awarded to items which were "High", but were being popularized, or might be considered spurious high culture. The newest ideas somewhat watered down or translated for consumption of a wider public--just as Newsweek called Marshall McLuhan's paperback The Medium is the Message "a once-over-lightly kneading of the ideas contained in McLuhan's Understanding Media".²⁴ If Partisan Review is worth five points, then Saturday Review, which is more a popularizer of innovative ideas than the most avant-garde type of periodical, must be worth four points in an index like ours. Four points were awarded to items imitative of the highest cultural level, which were still demanding of thought and involvement. A great deal of non-fiction book-writing, such as social history, fits this category.²⁵

Three points were awarded to the "Middlebrow" or "Midcult" items. These are the current hits, slick, sophisticated, and extremely popular.

Some are pretentiously dressed to imitate High culture, with witty criticisms disguising banalities. Dwight Macdonald finds the ambiguity of midcult alarming--it grew from high and mass culture and now "threatens to absorb both its parents".²⁶ Items ranked at three points are often subtly editorializing, supporting the major social values. The Book-of-the-Month Club is a guide to current mid-cult taste, it dispenses sure things which have saleability and sophistication. Our judges considered Vance Packard an excellent example of middle culture, and as typical examples Playboy, Vogue, and many famous authors: Hemingway, Ian Fleming, etc.²⁷

Two points were awarded to the level of Masscult which wanted to be Midcult--to the equivalents in media items of Miami which wants to be the Cote d'Azur. The upper level of Low culture has a formula, a built-in reaction, is very obviously hammering home the norms and values of the majority. It is sometimes slick, more often 'folksy' and sentimental. Norman Fockwell covers on the Saturday Evening Post exemplified this level, as do many of the family programs on television, and novelists like Pearl Buck.²⁸ There are few attempts at intellectualism in these items, their intention is to 'grab you' emotionally, sensationally, and to reinforce a simple world-view.

One point was awarded to the clearly Masscult level of Low cultural offerings, the level of blatant and earthy humor, 'gutsy' emotional reaction and a formula plot. Reactions are programmed to be extremely obvious to spectators who want immediate pleasure, grief, thrills --as with soap operas, westerns where the hero wears a white hat and the villain a black one. The Low culture level has a concern with violence or sex in a maudlin or vulgar manner--True Story, Mike Hammer stories,

Elvis Presley, Liberace, Zane Grey and dozens of other western authors. These items grew out of the folk culture of peasant strata of earlier societies, and concern themselves with 'reality' and an old-fashioned morality for coping. Macdonald's examples,²⁹ including Presley and Liberace, are somewhat dated, and he might currently consider some of the 'soul' singers to be representative: James Brown, Otis Redding.

The risk of awarding quality points to individual media items is two-fold: personal tastes and biases undoubtedly influence such ranking, and secondly, cultural levels are changing rapidly and are adding additional dimensions. Instead of re-scoring all the items in 1968 to reflect the current status of the Beatles, This Hour has Seven Days, and certain magazines, the 1965 placements have been kept. After all, the respondents have not had another chance to update their preferences in media items.

Quality scores were considered in their raw form, of summation of quality points. However, the range of raw scores from 4 to 66 points, does not tell us respondent consistency in the quality levels making up these points. Quality scoring is always impure, in that it cannot be considered apart from the amount of exposure. We shall argue that exposure is a social status indicator, because wealth and leisure time are involved. The quality score had to take account of the number of items worth from one to five points. Rather than the mean, which distorts the score in favor of extreme values, the median was used.³⁰

A median score of the quality points for each respondent was derived, showing for the seventy respondents a range of 1.0 to 3.3. The modal score of the entire distribution was 2.0. While points ranged from one to five, the range of medians reflects the involvement in low and

middle levels of culture, and perhaps the heavy bias in the availability of low and middle items to the Edmonton population.³¹ Further implications of this potential bias in media offerings will be seen later in the chapter, as each media is discussed.

Medians of the quality points can best be exemplified by reporting the actual scores of some representative respondents. Although the range of points was narrow, we have considered a low, middle and high ranking of the medians, cutting the sample as evenly as possible.

Low.....	1.0 - 1.8	(n=25)
Middle.....	1.9 - 2.4	(n=23)
High.....	2.5 - 3.3	(n=22)

Two respondents who illustrate the Low level of media quality are Respondent 22, whose median quality score is 1.0; and Respondent 01, whose median quality score is 1.8. Despite the number of media exposures, these people are more exposed to the Low level of one or two points for quality.

	Points	Number	
Respondent 22	1	6	
	2	2	
	3	3	
	5	1	Total number: 12 Median 1.0
	Points	Number	
Respondent 01	1	1	
	2	5	
	3	2	Total number: 8 Median 1.8

The two respondents who will illustrate the Middle level of media quality both happen to have nine items of 3-point-level quality, but a very different range of scores. Respondent 31 has a median of 2.4 and Respondent 54 has a median of 2.3 with five exposure items more.

Respondent 31	1	1	
	3	9	
	4	1	Total number: 11 Median 2.4

Respondent 54	1	1	
	2	4	
	3	9	
	4	1	
	5	1	Total number: 16 Median 2.3

The representatives of the High level of media quality involvement have a higher number and range of exposures than the earlier examples. Respondent 44 has a median quality score of 2.6, and Respondent 61 has one of the highest-levels of exposure, with a median score of 3.2 quality points.

Respondent 44	2	4	
	3	8	
	4	4	
	5	2	Total number: 18 Median 2.6

Respondent 61	1	1	
	3	5	
	4	5	
	5	3	Total number: 14 Median 3.2

Quality and quantity of exposure to the mass media are closely related, as revealed in Table IV -12 which shows significance between .01 and .001 between the quality medians and number of exposures of respondents. Only one person whose median quality score is high has a low number of exposures. Similarly, only three people high in media exposure are low in median quality points. We do not find Wilensky's point to be clearly borne out, that people are often high exposed to poor quality media.³² Rather, the high-exposed tend to have high quality scores, and the low-exposed have low quality scores. The middle-exposed more often have Low median quality scores than Middle, which is the only indicator that some people are selective of poor quality media offerings, no matter to how much they are exposed.

The table might have shown a clearer tendency toward low exposure selection if the quality medians had been simply dichotomized into Low

and High.

Wilensky's findings may not apply to our five media, since he was more concerned with exposure to television, and found a syndrome of compulsive viewing of escapist, visceral-response types of programs.³³ In considering each of the media, we can look at the representative respondents in their involvement with Low level (1 or 2 points), Middle level (3 points), or High level (4 or 5 points) of each of the media. First the two respondents illustrating the Low level, whose median scores were 1.8 and 1.0.³⁴

By media, Respondent 01 can be considered to be exposed to books and magazines more than the audio-visual media. Her eight exposures are predominantly Low in quality: 1 television item ranked Low; 1 magazine ranked Low, 1 ranked Middle; 3 books ranked Low; 1 musical item ranked Middle; 1 radio station ranked Low. She had six Low items, two Middle and no High items.

Respondent 22 is exposed to all the media, with more television and musical items than literary media. Her twelve exposures are strongly Low in quality: 2 television items rank Low, 1 ranked High; 2 magazines are Low; 2 books are Middle; 2 musical items are Low, 1 is Middle; and 2 radio stations ranked Low. Altogether she had eight Low items, three Middle, and 1 High item.

Next, the two who illustrate the Middle level, with medians of 2.4 and 2.3.

Respondent 31 is most exposed to magazines--seven of his eleven items are periodicals. His 1 television item ranked Low, 6 of his magazines ranked Middle, 1 ranked High; no book items; 2 musical items ranked Middle; 1 radio station ranked Middle. He had one Low item, nine Middles, and one High item.

Respondent 54 is more exposed to magazines than to other media, but his general exposure is high as evidenced by sixteen exposure items. He is Middle exposed: 2 television items ranked Low, 1 ranked Middle, and 1 ranked High; 1 magazine ranked Low, 4 ranked Middle; 1 book is Low, 2 rank Middle, and 1 ranked High; the 1 musical item ranked Middle; 1 radio station ranked Low, 1 ranked Middle. In sum, he had five Low items, nine Middle, and two High ranking items.

And the respondents exemplifying the High level, whose medians were 2.6 and 3.2.

Respondent 44 is most exposed to books and magazines, equally so. Ten of her exposures are High in quality: 1 television item ranked Low, 2 ranked High; 1 magazine ranked Low, 4 ranked High; 1 book ranked Low, 3 ranked Middle and 1 ranked High; 1 musical item ranked Low, 1 ranked Middle and 2 ranked High; 1 radio station ranked High. Altogether she had 4 Low items, 4 Middle items, and 10 High items.

The media most claiming Respondent 61's attention are magazines, but a relatively high involvement with several media is notable. Her 2 television items rank High; 4 of the magazines rank Middle, and 1 ranks High; 1 book ranks Middle, 1 ranks High; 1 musical item ranks Low and 2 rank High; the 2 radio stations rank High. This individual is predominantly exposed to High quality media: there was 1 Low item, 5 Middle items, and 8 High items, totalling 14 exposures.

The six respondents discussed above were selected to illustrate the variation in response which exists in the data, and the process of scoring each media item. However, the details of item-scoring are now reported: when Respondent 31 gives seven magazines, when Respondent 44 gives four musical items, how many points were awarded to each? We must proceed with a discussion of the five media, television, magazines, books, musical types, and radio stations, dealing with each in turn.

Judges had not been asked to rank television programs, because of the sheer number of changes in schedules of programs from year to year, and region to region. From John Irving's book on media in Canada, and American studies which discussed particular network programs,³⁵ a standard for placing television could be found. The "High" category would include the serious drama productions, like Festival has been showing on CBC-TV for some years, as well as documentary programs of a critical, scientific or generally thoughtful nature, like Explorations and Perspective, and the controversial This Hour Has Seven Days. News magazine programs, editorials of a contemplative not sensational nature, and some panel shows were also to be included in "High", but were given four points instead of five.

"Middle" quality television would include the espionage and

detective programs, like Danger Man and Defenders, and also the professional situation programs like Dr. Kildare and Mr. Novak, plus some humor shows and some musical programs. Most westerns and mysteries were classed as "Low", though some were given two points instead of one--such as Bonanza and Perry Mason. Variety shows, family comedies and musicals were also counted as Low, for example Ed Sullivan, Bewitched, No Time For Sergeants, Andy Williams, and so on. Sports programs were also classed as Low, along with women's programs like Cooking school, and general responses which did not name the program: "westerns", "mysteries".

As we have seen, exposure could vary greatly, and so could the levels to which respondents were exposed. Television accounted for 23% of the total media exposure, and when we consider the television items were scored from one to five, it is the level of two points which is most viewed. In fact, 40% of the television viewing of all respondents is at the 2-point level--light, family entertainment. The most-watched shows at this level are Perry Mason, Ed Sullivan and Bonanza.³⁶ Perry Mason is second only to This Hour Has Seven Days in popularity with these respondents.

Only ten per cent of the viewing is at the five-point level, about the same percentage as view sports! The controversial interview and comment show, This Hour Has Seven Days probably should not have been awarded five-points, for without it, the highest category receives only 4% of the viewing-time.

A tabulation was made to show how each respondent was exposed to each of the media. Considering 5 and 4 points as "High", 3 points as "Middle", and 2 and 1 point as "Low", we can see that respondents vary from total exposure to Low quality media, through a variety of mixtures

of the three levels, to someone with two Low items, two Middle items, and ten High items of exposure. A great number of respondents, 24 (34.5%), have no items which rank "High". Three are exposed only to "Low" ranking media offerings, with no "Middle" or "High" items.

Turning to magazines, they also were ranked from one to five points, in the same way as was television. As was mentioned in the discussion of exposure, it appears that magazines are an indicator of social status, for certainly the more affluent respondents bought and subscribed to more periodicals than the relatively impoverished ones. Despite the judges' able ranking magazines from high to low, decisions occasionally differed with their placement of a magazine in "Middle" or "Low Middle".

The only magazine mentioned by respondents which seemed worthy of the highest category of five points was Atlantic Monthly. Periodicals like The New Yorker, Fortune, Holiday, and some trade magazines like Oral Health, MD, Canadian Interiors were placed in the four-point category. These two "High" categories included only six per cent of the magazine readership of our respondents. By far the majority read "Middle" (3-point) qualities of magazines: 62% of the magazines named fell in this category.

Most popular was Time (24 readers), then Maclean's (22), Ladies' Home Journal (16), Chatelaine (11), and McCall's (10 readers). It was almost surprising that so many read the two Canadian magazines, although in terms of total readership, many more American periodicals are read by the respondents than are Canadian. This will be further discussed in Chapter VI. At this point, clarification is needed of the kinds and examples of magazines which were placed in each of the categories. In addition to the above popular "Middle" magazines, were other news and

financial comment periodicals, such as Newsweek, Financial Post, Business Week. Also at three points were the household and decorating magazines, such as Better Homes and Gardens, and other women's magazines: Good Housekeeping, Cosmopolitan, Pedbook, Charm. Several hobby and sports magazines, and travel magazines were also ranked as "Middle": National Geographic, Sports Illustrated and Sports Afield, Golf Digest, Ski, Car and Driver, Scottish Field.

The "Low Middle" category included 25% of the named magazines. The most popular one was The Reader's Digest (20 readers), followed by Life (13) and Saturday Evening Post (6).³⁷ This category included most of the man's outdoor magazines, such as Argosy, True, Outdoor Life, Rod and Gun, and family magazines such as Parent's Magazine and Family Circle. Religious and sectarian magazines were also classified as "Low Middle", such as United Church Observer, and Dare.

A problem area was the lowest category. Few genuinely sensational magazines were mentioned by our respondents, True Story and Liberty being the only ones, and fitting the known pattern of lower-class readership.³⁸ However, The Star Weekly was included in this category, as a sometimes sensational picture magazine, and perhaps Life ought to have been classed here instead of just above.³⁹ The two farm magazines which were mentioned by respondents were classed in the "Low" category, Family Herald and The Country Guide, for a different reason than sensationalism. These represent a subculture which is attempting to technically discuss farming procedures, but whose magazines also have been aimed at the farm family's entertainment--hobbies, fiction and spiritual guidance. The farm magazines are nearly unclassifiable because their levels of appeal are so many.

As was mentioned before, books were not widely read by our respondents, or were not easily recalled during the interview. However, those authors and book titles which were named provide an interesting picture of the levels of cultural involvement of the respondents. Books have long been used as a means of culture-ranking, and Wilensky, Macdonald and others have frequently commented that whether one reads books or not is an indicator of the impact of the other mass media.⁴⁰ The judges' rankings of authors further facilitated the interpretation of book readership.

Books and authors whose style and symbolism are considered intellectual or need thoughtful concentration, were ranked at five points: only three were so classed: Thomas Mann, Eugene O'Neill and John Updike. It was felt that those books and authors of classical fame as literary masterpieces should be included in "High" at four points. Some non-fiction as well as fiction was included: The Dead Sea Scrolls, Churchill's Hinge of Fate, biographical works, and novels like Cronin's The Citabel, Shute's On the Beach, Cather's My Antonia, mention of authors like Hemingway, Churchill, Saint-Exupery.⁴¹ Such an interpretation of the "High" category resulted in 29% of the books read falling into it.

The "Middle" category included many of the current best-sellers which respondents were reading, such as Fleming's James Bond novels, Fanny Hill, Hawaii, My Life in Court and Harlow. Also included here were travel books like Of Sheep and Men, and MacGregor's Yellowhead Route, plus standard and popular works of fiction by authors like Frank Slaughter, Harper Lee, O. Henry, Agatha Christie, John O'Hara, Sinclair Lewis. The "Middle" category accounted for 34% of the book readership of these respondents.

Somewhat more sensational or sentimental works were awarded two points for the "Low Middle" category. Authors like Harold Robbins, Frank Yerby, Earle Stanley Gardiner, Ellery Queen, Edna Ferber--and titles like Foxes of Harrow, Gone with the Wind, Snake Pit, The Governor's Lady, Power of Black were all considered to fit here. Romances, nurse stories, and the somewhat missionary works of Pearl Buck and Dr. Tom Dooley were included, with adventures and mysteries too. It could be argued that the line between "Middle" and "Low Middle" is controversial and subject to bias, but the arbitrary limit was defined as best-seller status for three points. The two-point category received 33% of the readership of books, which meant that the three central categories accounted for four-fifths of the readership.

Book-reading	5 points.....	3	(3.1%)
	4 points.....	25	(25.8%)
	3 points.....	33	(34.0%)
	2 points.....	32	(32.9%)
	1 point.....	4	(4.1%)

Few of the books read were at the sensational-pulp level worthy of one point. War stories, Mike Hammer books, Zane Grey's Western Union, and one children's book: Black Beauty constituted all the "Low" readership.

Respondents' preferences in types of music were similarly ranked from one to five points, as well as the answers permitted. As was discussed earlier, replies were very general, sometimes only the genre was given. However, on the basis of the judges' recommendations of quality-levels of composers, the musical rankings went as follows.

Five points was awarded to 'classical', 'opera', 'symphony' and such composers as Bach. Ten respondents stated that they like classical music best, and taken with the other five-point items, the "High" category included over eleven per cent of the responses.

Four points was the category for replies like "ballet--Swan Lake", "excerpts from opera", "the Mozart line" etc. Jazz was also awarded four, on the grounds that the progressive and third-stream types of jazz involved the listener's thoughtful concentration. Ten per cent of the musical choices were found in this category, so that the two "High" classes accounted for just over one-fifth of the musical preferences.

The "Middle" category of three points contained such composers as Chopin and Tchaikovsky, and the category "semi-classical" (which was mentioned by 16 respondents). Light opera and operettas were included here, as were "Broadway musicals", "ballads", "modern music like Mitch Miller", etc. Folk music was also included here, since the genre has risen in status from appreciation by hillbillies to a coffee-house and concert musical form. The "Middle" level accounted for 34% of the musical preferences.

Two points and "Low-Middle" status was awarded to responses such as "old-time" or "European waltzes and polkas", "old favorites", "singers like Andy Williams", "piano" and "hymns or choir music". This was also the level chosen for people who could not narrow their preferences beyond "any kind of music"--a response which should have been probed further. Just over one-quarter of the musical preferences fell into the two-point category.

The "Low" category of one point was reserved for "popular", "hit parade" and "Beatles and rock groups". Additionally, country and western music was placed here. The two classes of popular and western music made up most of the "Low" items, which accounted for 19% of the musical preferences. Of course, what the respondents called "popular" may have

actually deserved another name,⁴² if they meant the experimental music loosely labelled folk-rock which combines social protest and new musical tonalities. But since the "popular" label was usually given without further specification, the entire group was classed here.

Most of the music named by respondents as their favorite type was classed, then, in the "Middle" group: 34%. If a follow-up question had asked for specific performers, solo or group, or for names of favorite compositions, the musical responses would have been more detailed and useful. This idea had been dropped because of the problems of coding individual performers or names of orchestras or of instruments, and the myriad possibilities of names of compositions. Until this much detail is attempted, however, musical tastes cannot be adequately tallied, nor quality levels demarcated.

Radio was ranked very simply. Only the names of the station most preferred by the respondent were requested, and these were quality-ranked in the following manner. A non-commercial station which featured long hours of serious music, panel discussions and lectures was awarded five points as the "High" choice. It was the preference of 18% of the listeners in the sample.⁴³

The CBC station and an FM station were ranked as four-point quality, since they offered a balanced fare of music of serious and popular types, talks and service programs. These "High Middle" stations accounted for 8% of the radio choices.

Ranked as "Middle" were the local French-language station and one commercial station which appeals to family-listening. These stations offer a variety of sentimental orchestral programs, popular and some serious music, with homemaker's advice programs and other service features.

They accounted for 27% of the radio listening--of which nearly 7% were preferences for the French-language station.

Two other commercial stations in the city were scored differently despite similarities in popular music programming. Two points and "Low Middle" status was decided to fit the station which not only featured the latest hits, but also maintained a high ratio of news coverage and editorial comment in a 'hot-line' program. This classification resulted in 13% of the preferences falling into the two-point category.

The "Low" quality level was reserved for the local station which appealed particularly to the teenagers, with its programming of hit music, frenetic announcements and sensational news coverage. Also placed here were preferences for a district radio station which featured country and western music and fundamentalist religious programs. Thus, the two stations classed as "Low" accounted for 34% of the listener's preferences--of which about 20% were for the local pop music station.

The modal category then is "Low", surpassing the "Middle" classifications in only this case of radio station preference, and which would have shown a more typical media pattern if the pop music station had been ranked at two-points. If more details of the types of radio programs themselves had been obtained, the station-ranking would have been more reliable. However, the general ranking of stations at least includes radio in the media considered. And in Canada, radio has served as a vital communication link between the populated areas. Only eight of the seventy respondents had no interest or preference in radio--even if their major informational sources are television and magazines.

Bruce Raymond makes a point about private commercial stations and the publicly owned CBC which reveals another dimension of radio quality:

Spokesmen for the private radio concept, however, claim that if the Canadian commercial station is criticized for being American-oriented, CBC Radio is under suspicion for being long-hair.⁴⁴

Then we note that the quality rankings of radio stations reflect commercialism as well as serious program content: our "High" station is non-commercial and our "Low" station is exceedingly commercial in the sense of frequency of advertising broadcast. The proportion of airtime available for cultural information and messages is, thus, higher for the non-commercial stations.

Indicators of Dependent Variables

The previous chapter mentioned that two abortive scores were derived to measure Anti-Intellectualism and Conservatism. These scores were discarded because of problems of validity, and because respondents did not sufficiently distribute with them. At this point, the scores will be briefly discussed, so that the reasons for their omission are clear.

Anti-Intellectualism Score

Because the concept of 'anti-intellectualism' is both complex and multi-dimensional, it was assumed that the score might reliably and validly tap a variety of attitude indicators. Component items were devised from a number of questions which were scored 0 for positive responses and 1 for hostile or presumably negative responses. For example, one item asked whether respondents considered all intellectuals to be atheists, on the assumption that general agreement would not only stereotype the intellectual's belief system, but would be accompanied by a clearly ambivalent or negative attitude. It was assumed that atheists are undesirable to most citizens.⁴⁵ However, there is belated realization that the academic community does not view atheism as pejorative, nor as

the same thing which fundamentalist respondents consider it.⁴⁶ This became a dubious item.

Additionally, there was interpretive trouble when some of the respondents did not answer both aspects of such questions as the 'good' and 'bad' traits of intellectuals. Respondents who described bad traits in specified ways were given a point for intellectualism, but some did not mention these, they were busy answering the other aspect. Similarly with the types of intellectuals which they 'respect' and 'disrespect', not all respondents answered both parts of the question. To some extent, the familiarity with intellectualism could have distorted replies, for indeed there may be agreed upon-bad traits, and types of men of knowledge which those informed would consider worthy of disrespect. If these responses were known to denigrate all intellectuals we might consider the item indicative of anti-intellectualism. But in fact, there may be a higher standard of the criteria for intellectualism operating here, which does not imply negative attitudes at all. The intellectual may represent ten per cent of the population to subjects with a certain image, and only three per cent to others with a more restrictive definition.

Another item of the score was a check-list of adjectives, the negative choices being worth a possible eleven additional points. However, the list was not balanced by positive, negative and neutral adjectives, but only by the two extreme types--that is respondents were forced to choose between angelic and devilish adjectives, with no choices that let them select the "ordinary joe". Most chosen of the negative phrases was 'absent-minded' (13 choices), then 'snobs' (10), and 'mad genius type' (9)--while only one respondent chose 'lazy spongers'. The exemplified words show that the category was somewhat extreme.

The six component items of the Anti-Intellectualism Score were unknown in their actual measurement of hostility toward the man of knowledge. Until the research into this social type has proceeded to a general agreement on the components of the various definitions of intellectualism, we are unsure when respondents are being restrictive and when they are actually being hostile to all intellectuals.

Conservatism Score

At the analysis stage, another score was devised from the data, to attempt to indicate Conservatism. It was composed of four items, crudely scored cumulatively to total nine possible points on a Conservatism Score. The four items were willingness to restrict certain teachers from teaching, banning of communists on the mass media, choice of a right-wing political party in federal elections, and professed religious fundamentalism.

Two of the score items were attitudinal, whether teachers or communists should be limited, and two of the items were behavioral, whether the respondent voted conservatively, or professed what liberal church-goers consider to be conservative denominations.⁴⁷ It is highly doubtful whether the obvious multiple dimensionality of types of items would produce a valid measure of conservatism. Genuine conservatism in values, preferences and attitudes was not adequately tapped in this study, and after the score was tabulated against other variables, it showed highly random results. Its overwhelming insignificance is exemplified in the fact that when cross-tabulated with the Anti-Intellectualism Score, the chi-square was at the .80 level, and one item was common to both scores!

Therefore, the Conservatism Score was dropped from further con-

sideration, since it evidently did not index the underlying trait of small-"c" conservative values. Instead of a combination of attitude and affiliation items which happened to be in the interview schedule, the score should have been planned before that stage to utilize selected attitude measures. A discussion of a Conservatism Score of two attitude items would be a very questionable measure of the trait. In Kerlinger's discussion of an index, he cautions: "Because they are often a mixture of two fallible measures, indices can be dangerous".⁴⁸ Thus, the Conservatism measure was also discarded as a score which failed.

Summary

This chapter has discussed the several scores which were devised to rank such variables as Social Class, Media Exposure, Media Quality, Anti-Intellectualism and Conservatism.

The component items were elaborated for each score, and their 'fit' with the score total was reported so as to indicate the items of weight and those of tenuous connection. Tables were included to illustrate this fit. The methods of assigning points to the various items were described, so that the Social Class Score ranged for each individual from 4 to 16 possible points; the Media Exposure score depended on the real number of items, and ranged from 3 to 22 points. Paw scores of Media Quality ranged from 4 to 66 points, but medians were tabulated for each respondent, ranging from 1.0 to 3.3.

Two scores which were discarded after preliminary analysis were discussed, the Anti-Intellectualism and the Conservatism scores. The validity of these scores was too doubtful for use of them in the data analysis.

The variables which tapped the image of the intellectual will be

discussed in the next chapter, and there too will occur the content analysis of respondents' descriptions of intellectual characteristics, status and role, goals and interests.. A second analysis chapter, Chapter VI, will discuss the two area sub-samples and the inter-relation of the variables whose scores were described in this chapter.

FOOTNOTES CHAPTER IV

1. Hubert M. Blalock, Social Statistics, (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1960) p. 10.
2. The Theoretical Discussion of Social Class was introduced in Chapters I and II. The objective method of measurement which was easily attainable from respondent data has been argued to indicate "social world" better than reputational measures of social class.
3. This was the view of Paul K. Hatt, in his chapter "Occupations and Social Stratification" of A. Riess, Occupations and Social Status, (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1961), pp. 239-244. He did not wish occupation to be the sole indicator of status position, though its importance is evident in a society in which members ask each other "What do you do?"
4. Bernard R. Blishen, "The Construction and Use of an Occupational Class Scale" in his Canadian Society, (Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Ltd., 1961) pp. 481-484.
5. The 1961 Census uses only two categories over six thousand dollars: "\$6,000.--\$9,999." and their uppermost category, "10,000. and over"; see Census Bulletin CT-21, p. 12. It shows that the average wage-and-salary income for the Flats in 1961, per family, was \$3,847. For Edmonton city, average family income was \$5,400.; and for the Heights it was \$8,405., pp. 9-11.
6. A card was handed to the respondent with the instruction that he was to mark the fifteen-hundred-dollar category in which his income fell, and the alternative in which his spouse's earnings fell. Because of detailed occupational information from the respondents who refused to divulge their incomes, an estimate of the appropriate categories was made for the analysis.
7. Education is one of the social class indicators which, in a middle-class city like Edmonton, tends to cluster most respondents in the middle. The 33 respondents with 9 to 12 years of schooling constitute 47% of our sample, and 22 of them (31.4%) obtained academic high school educations, the remainder attaining vocational or technical educations.
8. Blishen's scale, op. cit., was obtained from arranging the occupations reported in the 1951 Canadian Census in terms of standard scores for the incomes and years of schooling of their job-holders. Blishen admits that the "class divisions were somewhat arbitrary, and the sizes of the class intervals. . were unequal." (p. 478) Classes are not designated in Blishen's original paper.
9. For one thing, housewife is a comprehensive category covering several roles, and most of these individual jobs are found in the bottom occupational class of Blishen's scale: cook, laundress, charworker and cleaner, housekeeper and matron.

10. In Blishen's revision of his scale, he states: "Only occupations characteristic of males in the labour force were included, on the assumption that the family's social status is dependent upon the occupation of the husband rather than the wife when both are working." Blishen, "A Socio-Economic Index for Occupations in Canada", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, Vol. 4, No. 1, (February, 1967) p. 42.
11. Blishen, "The Construction and Use of an Occupational Class Scale", op. cit., p. 478.
12. Hence, approximately six per cent of the respondents score at each of the most extreme categories.
13. Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967), p. 42.
14. A motion picture may have several levels of content throughout its duration, but additionally, judgments as to movie quality often are based on the names of director and stars. Judges were highly inconsistent in assessing the movie titles given. Newspapers would have been a useful measure in a city where there was more than one daily paper to choose from.
15. Most of the evidence cited earlier comes from an article by Leo Bogart "The Mass Media and the Blue-Collar Worker", in Shostak, A.B. and Gomberg, W., Blue-Collar World, (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964) pp. 416-429.
16. More rarely, a respondent would say "I watch them all", and his stated hours of daily viewing would bear this out. Probing would attempt some differentiation of his preferences, but sometimes with no success.
17. Also included were Popular Mechanics, Canadian Interiors, and MD--the latter included because physicians leave it in waitingrooms, so it may not be considered overly technical.
18. Only two or three explained that they had difficulty reading English, and could not understand most books. If they had read a book for enjoyment in German, Pussian or whatever their language, that was taken as an item.
19. The four-way trial distribution of media exposure was as follows:

Low.....	3 to 5 points	(n= 6)
Low Middle.....	6 to 11 points	(n=40)
High Middle.....	12 to 15 points	(n=13)
High.....	16 to 22 points	(n=11)

Unless one attempts these rough rankings, it is impossible to know how lop-sided a distribution is. Clearly from this one, the Low category had to be raised to 7 or 8 points.

20. Their 'overexposure' is of course relative to the amounts reported by the remainder of the sample, and to ability to recall media items to list.
21. The discussion of the conceptual background of media quality was begun on page 45 of Chapter II, and hinges on Russell Lynes, The Tastemakers, (New York: Harper & Bros., 1954) and Dwight Macdonald, Against the American Grain, (New York: Random House, 1962).
22. A paper involving indicators of general 'interests' will go beyond the mass media to discuss the data on art, automobile choice and drinking habits. Of specific relevance to the dependent variables in this study on intellectuals, though, are the findings on media exposure and quality.
23. Although Schönberg was considered an excellent example of "High" quality musical composers by several of the judges, single mentions were made of other composers: Bach, Berlioz, Brahms, GianCarlo Menotti, Howard Brubeck, Prokofieff, Violet Archer, Vivaldi, Wagner and Stockhausen. This list in itself presents a range of taste and of genre.
24. From Newsweek's Special Report on McLuhan, March 6, 1967. Understanding Media was released in 1964, (Toronto: New American Library, Signet), and the simplified version called The Medium is the Message was published by Bantam in 1967. This exemplifies with one author's work, how a difficult or complex presentation may be rewritten, simplified and its level of quality lowered.
25. The contemporary writing on Black Power and student revolts include books of both 4-point and 3-point quality. Narrative histories of the wars of this century, such as Churchill's series on the second world war, were frequently mentioned by respondents, and classed at this level.
26. Macdonald, op. cit., p. 37. His clear dislike of Midcult colors his description of its traits, a tendency which sociologists like Lewis Coser and Edward Shils do not totally avoid either; respectively in Men of Ideas, (New York: The Free Press, 1965) and "Mass Society and its Culture". Culture for the Millions?, ed. by Norman Jacobs (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964), pp. 1-27.
27. Many magazines were classed by our judges as "Middle" in quality: such as Pedbook, Time, Ladies' Home Journal, Good Housekeeping, McCall's. Some of these we have retained at the three-point level, some are 'demoted' to the two-point level because of its conceptualization.
28. The Reader's Digest, Life, and other mass-circulated magazines are indicators of the sensational yet moralistic offerings at this level.

29. Macdonald, op. cit., pp. 27-37, mentions as examples of Masscult, J.T. Farrell's Studs Lonigan trilogy, *Liberace*, Boca Raton (the "Spanish" suburb of Palm Beach), Zane Grey, Howard Chandler Christy, Cecil B. DeMille, and Elvis Presley.

30. The median is "a number which has the property of having the same number of scores with smaller values as there are with larger values. Ordinarily, the median thus divides the scores in half". H.M. Blalock, op. cit., p. 49. Blalock comments further, "the mean uses more information than the median in the sense that all of the exact scores are used in computing the mean whereas the median really only involves the score of the middle case. . . . The mean is affected by changes in extreme values whereas the median will be unaffected unless the value of the middle case is also changed." (p. 57)

31. As was discussed in Chapter II, the media themselves are biased in favor of offerings which have mass acceptability, and magazines, television programs, for example, in Edmonton presented proportionately more middle-level than highest-level of items. The number of drugstores and magazine counters which sold True would likely outweigh the number which sold Atlantic, let alone Partisan Review. However, a rigorous count was not made.

32. Harold Wilensky, "Mass Society and Mass Culture", ASP, XLX, No. 2 (April, 1964) p. 182. One of the two strong factors from his analysis was "much exposure to poor TV", defined as the high number of hours per week of television viewing, and many westerns, detective, and adventure programs as favorites. However, his definition of 'poor TV' relates to his study of men only, important in considering that these viewers were "involved with the western-detective-adventure triumvirate. ." Wilensky's second strong factor was "low leisure competence" by which he classed compulsive absorption of much poor TV as a time filler, which might have been involved in the three people who were highly exposed to low quality.

33. As mentioned immediately above, his male viewers watch westerns, detective programs and adventures, and their viewing is in company "with others; when they are away from home they are likely to discuss television often with friends or relatives". They feel they'd "rather do something else, but he just can't tear himself away". Wilensky, loc cit., pp. 182-183. Clearly, he was able to obtain this information by many detailed questions on viewing and other leisure habits.

34. The following paragraphs are summaries of data reported by these respondents. Respondent numbers have no other significance than the sequence in which the seventy interviews were made.

35. John A. Irving, Mass Media in Canada, (Toronto: Pyerson Press, 1962), particularly his closing article on "The problems of the mass media" pp. 221-223, and Eugene Hallman's article on "Television", pp. 119-151. We find the old argument that Canadians watch American programs, our networks showing popular American television shows

concurrently or the season after their achieving U.S. popularity. Canadian television productions have, on the publically-owned network, attempted a balance of quality and type: serious dramas, ballet and symphonies being shown in proportion to country and western programs, c.f. Chapter II, pp. 135-136.

Harold Wilensky, op. cit., says each of his media items was classed "in three 'brow' levels--high quality, trash, or neither. . The product does not have to be aggressively educative to bet by as highbrow, but if it is drama, the contrast is 'Playhouse 90' versus the most stereotypical detective, western, and adventure shows; if it is a paperback mystery, the contrast is Agatha Christie or Chandler vs. Spillane". p. 182. Wilbur Schramm appends chapters with tables on the mass media, in his Mass Communications (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1960). Changes in values in periodical fiction are shown for this century, p. 412.

36. Perry Mason was named as a favorite of nine viewers, Bonanza by eight, Ed Sullivan by seven; but the single most-popular show was This Hour Has Seven Days, named by twelve. It is possible that by asking respondents to recall their favorite shows, instead of giving them a check-list, some of the most-watched programs were missed--for example, six persons said they always watched the national news broadcast at eleven, but undoubtedly others would have included it if given a sheet of programs.
37. The Reader's Digest is the most widely circulated magazine in the world, and in Canada John Porter reports its monthly circulation in English and French at almost one million copies; Vertical Mosaic, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965) p. 465. He reports the findings of a Royal Commission on Publications in 1959, the most-circulated magazines in Canada were the above-mentioned Reader's Digest, then Chatelaine, Liberty, Maclean's, Life, Family Circle, Ladies' Home Journal, McCall's, Saturday Evening Post, and Time.
38. Family Circle, Woman's Day, Liberty or often, The Star Weekly and other popular magazines are sold near the check-out counters of supermarkets. The low price and easy availability of magazines such as these may raise the magazine-consumption of the lower socio-economic group, for whom Playboy at 75¢ is a luxury. But economic reasons aside, the lower class is still selective in its purchases. Footnote 85 in Chapter II quotes Leo Bogart's finding that six per cent of subscribers to Harper's may be lower class, but 67% of True Story readers were blue-collar wives.
39. Life has the sensational photo-coverage aspect, but also features lengthy photo-essays on important people and issues, such as a story on Jean-Paul Sartre, or a feature on intellectual life in Russia. It was on this basis that it was included in "Low-Middle" instead of "Low".

40. Bogart, op. cit., uses the term print-oriented and television-oriented to distinguish the middle class from the lower class media consumption-pattern. Wilensky's comments, op. cit., relate to the decline in exposure to serious reading even by the most highly educated: ". . .they spend a reduced fraction of time in exposure to quality print and film. This trend extends to the professors, writers, artists, scientists--the keepers of high culture themselves --and the chief culprit, again, is TV." p. 190. Dwight Macdonald, op. cit., p. 38, points out that subscription clubs like The Book-of-the-Month Club, and certain publicized awards like Pulitzer Prizes, keep the Mid-cult level of consumers in touch with books, even if they don't read what they buy.
41. A possible distortion of the "High" book-reading category is the inclusion of authors and books mentioned by two respondents who were taking courses in literature. In particular, Cather, Sinclair Lewis, Dreiser, and Hemingway were mentioned by a housewife who was studying American literature. However, her enjoyment of these books was genuine, and so the interviewer included them.
42. The layman's vocabulary seems to have lagged in connection with innovations in music--what was being labelled "folk-rock" in radio circles in 1964 were the Bob Dylan, Beatles, Rolling Stones experiments with social protest themes. . Our respondents classed them as "popular". Edmonton media almost never broadcast the electronic musical experiments of John Cage or the west coast groups like the Jefferson Airplane.
43. As in the other media to which some respondents were not exposed, the radio quality levels report only the distributions of persons who did state preferences. The eight who reported no interest in radio are not included in the percentages, as with those who were not involved with magazines or books.
44. John Porter makes this point clear in the Vertical Mosaic, op. cit., p. 466: "It is difficult under these conditions (of greater exposure to American than Canadian radio and television) for a society to provide itself with a distinct structure of values or with an image of itself as a distinct society." Bruce Paymond precedes the statement quoted by commenting on American values: "For Canadians, radio does not epitomize values that are exclusively or even predominantly Canadian. Our radio, particularly private broadcasting, speaks with an American vocabulary, expounds American philosophies and stimulates 'the great American dream'. It could be no other way for private commercial radio is only one expression of the North American free enterprise economy, which Canada shares with the U.S., though not as an equal partner". "Radio", in John A. Irving, op. cit., p. 107.
45. Hofstadter and Gurko both refer to the accusation of atheism made of intellectuals by early American fundamentalists, even by inference in the short stories Gurko discusses in Herces, Highbrows and the Popular Mind (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1962), pp. 38-41;

Richard Hofstadter, Anti-Intellectualism in American Life (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), pp. 129-133.

46. Discussion with C.W. Hobart, September 6, 1968. The critical and examining faculty of intellectualism surely does not leave religious beliefs unquestioned. Dr. Hobart raised the query as to the probable actual incidence of atheism on any university campus. Those who doubt the existence of God or gods may be objectively in the majority.
47. Though some fundamentalist groups are conservative in philosophy and practice, there is no reason why persons of reactionary or rigid values would not belong to the United and Anglican churches. Therefore, mere affiliation is not reliable as an indicator of theological conservatism.
48. Kerlinger, op. cit., pp. 616-618. For Kerlinger, an index could be a "composite of two or more other numbers." So, essentially two variables are not too few for indexing--as for example, IQ, which is an index composed of mental age divided by chronological age. However, the assumptions and underlying variables behind these two indicators make Kerlinger cautious that more is being "measured" than it appears. Our Conservatism Score would have been suspect, with its four uncertain variables, as would the more complex Anti-Intellectualism Score. We have shown that it may have been measuring restrictiveness of criteria for intellectualism as well.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS: THE IMAGE OF THE INTELLECTUAL

. . . your vagueness in supplying cognitive detail does not in the least invalidate your expression of attitude.

- L.L. Thurstone
"Measurement of
Social Attitudes"

This chapter will discuss the imagery which the research found to be associated with 'the intellectual' by Edmonton respondents. Personality and physical characteristics, essential interests and goals, careers and affiliations of intellectuals as perceived by sample members will be outlined. The profile will attempt to answer those of the Research Questions posed in Chapter II which have to do with the traits of intellectuals, and with the nature of anti-intellectualism revealed in the data. After tracing the image in this chapter, Chapter VI will analyze the differences between the views of Flats, Heights and Academic sub-groups. Verbatim comments from the interviews will illustrate this chapter on imagery, and cross-tabulations showing socio-economic and media involvement will present data in the following chapter.

In order to answer any of the Research Questions, the varied definitions of the so-called intellectual must be reported. For example, question one asked: "Will different descriptions and stated images of 'the intellectual' characterize persons of different social class positions? If so, in what way?" As we have said, the details of social class differences will be presented in the following chapter, but the imagery will be described here.

The wording of the initial question directed respondents toward the 'kind of person' and 'characteristics' of the so-called intellectual.¹

The levels and dimensions of the responses were many, including positive-negative, ascribed-achieved, role-status, even sketchy-thorough. We shall explore the themes, toward a general profile of characteristics.

Characteristics of Intellectuals

Of the seventy respondents, 54 mentioned 'knowledge' as a trait of the intellectual, in several senses. Some stressed that the so-called intellectual is seeking knowledge, others that he is an expert, full of knowledge whether it be formally acquired or not. For example:²

A woman in her late forties, Heights resident:
"Somebody clever and well-read, grasping for more knowledge all the time. . . . These students at the university who keep getting more and more degrees. Very prone to voice opinions, too."

A woman in her early thirties, Flats resident:
"Someone well-educated, been through university. . . up on things."

A man in his late sixties, Heights resident:
"Someone with a good grasp of everything we have to do with. One who reads, thinks, and has an opinion."

A man in his late fifties, Heights resident:
"An unintellectual is one not very well-posted on world affairs, can't express himself. . . Intellectuals could enter into conversation in any field and talk intellectual. Versed in writers of books, music."

A woman in her late thirties, Heights resident:
"The more educated they are, the closer they are to being one. . .professional. . .a great reader."

A woman in her early twenties, Flats resident:
"A person who thinks he knows everything about everything."

Although these are scattered examples of the responses which may be classed as stressing the education and 'wide knowledge' of the so-called intellectual, a pattern emerges. He is a learned person, whether by his own extensive reading, or inferred by his years of university study. He is a generalist, and can communicate widely because his knowledge extends to all fields, but this may yield an arrogance, even to dominating conversation. Thirty-three of the respondents (47%) discussed this theme of 'wide knowledge' in their initial reactions to the meaning of the label 'intellectual'.

Perhaps the easiest referent in defining the social type is to use the word at its root---intellect. Sixteen of the respondents concentrated their replies in this area, discussing the braininess or 'intelligence' of those they consider intellectuals.

A woman, mid-twenties, Flats resident:
 ". . You'd be almost afraid to speak to
 someone you feel is so much smarter."

A woman in her mid-forties, Flats resident:
 "Somebody clever, knows what he's talking
 about, and all that."

A man in his late forties, Heights resident:
 ". .A smart person. . don't know. .intelligent. ."

A woman in her early twenties, Flats resident:
 "Intellectual people are supposed to be people
 with great intelligence. . . Socially they are
 idiots."

A man in his late twenties, Flats resident:
 "Well. .I think a highly regarded person with
 brains. .smart."

Even the examples quoted here show that some of these respondents were having difficulty with the concept, or with their articulation of what it calls to mind. Cleverness, intelligence and enough brains that the average person is inhibited, these are reported

traits. Awe and prestige are evident, so is a hint of contempt at social gauchery, reminiscent of the findings of Leo Gurko.³ As will be discussed in the next chapter, there was a noticeable difference in the educations and other social class traits of those who formulated the characteristics of intellectuals solely in terms of 'intelligence', and those who emphasized the next theme.⁴

'Scholarly interests' or goals and favorite pursuits of intellectuals was stressed by 26 respondents. These replies tend to be lengthy, which may either be due to the greater educations of many who perceived this dimension, or to their more articulate attempts to clarify a murky concept. Again, we illustrate with a variety of replies which stressed the pursuit of scholarly interests or values of intellectuals:

A woman in her early twenties, Flats resident:
 "Someone that hasn't necessarily been formally educated but reads a lot, thinks about matters not everyday. Someone at the University doing original research."

A woman in her late thirties, Heights resident:
 "Rather studious type, has a variety of interests. Someone with an open mind, who isn't too one-sided in his opinion."

A man in his mid-thirties, Heights resident:
 "They question cause for effect and motive for action. Don't accept things without query, erudition. The general unacceptance of intellectualism is something I deplore: I think of Stevenson and the egghead label."

A woman in her late forties, Heights resident:
 "A thinking person, who enjoys ideas more than things; someone who spends much time with the arts; enjoys and understands them much more than most."

A woman in her early thirties, Heights resident:
 "True intellectual's a person who'd read very
 little fiction, would not enjoy folk or pop music
 to any extent---not quite that cold-sounding. A
 person with an excellent brain."

The theme of scholarship and seriousness is most evident in the above quotations. Not only are the thought processes stressed, but also the level of the concerns: 'matters not everyday', and careful open-mindedness. University research and the arts are both mentioned, and the affirmation in the last quote of high-minded interests above the tastes of the mass. A tendency exists here for an idealization, a super-brain stereotype which is somewhat recognized, deplored and softened: 'not quite that cold-sounding.' It is as if the very excellence of the intellect and the matters of concern to the intellectual are used as an apology for his peculiarities.⁵

The phrase "who enjoys ideas more than things" recalls the descriptions of the intellectual social type in Coser and Hofstadter: ". .in some sense he lives for ideas", and "he delights. .in the pursuit of sheer knowledge".⁶ It will be seen later in the chapter that most of the seventeen university faculty who were interviewed also discussed the intellectual's commitment to the world of ideas: "who accords to the life of the mind a primary role." Familiarity with the self-image of the intellectual seems to characterize many of the 26 respondents who described his concern with 'ideas', research, the arts.

Another theme of a small number of respondents was the status of intellectuals, their social prestige. A few examples illustrate the elite image, sometimes hostile, of these respondents:

A woman in her early forties, Flats resident:
 "Don't know. . I don't come in contact with
 people who do important jobs."

A woman of thirty, Flats resident:

"Our mayor. . . a man who can look after the city, his own business, etc. A man under pressure who knows the right way to get out of it."

A man in his mid-thirties, Flats resident:

"A person that's specialized in something. . . a dignified man."

Some people responded in terms of general personality characteristics, sometimes irrelevant, sometimes stressing moral excellence, which were coded as 'Other' replies:

A woman in mid-forties, Heights resident:

"A person with a broad outlook yet a definite purpose in life and one who has a fundamental religious background--believing the Bible in entirety. Sort of person I'd feel would give me the best advice."

A woman in her mid-sixties, Flats resident:

"Well, an honest person that has the courage of his convictions. . . That is, good for the people, interested in people not selfish for themselves."

A woman in her late forties, Flats resident:

"Studious, quiet, more an introvert than anything else."

Again, the idealistic character is stressed. We shall come back to the mention of unselfishness in discussing the social and personal goals perceived of intellectuals. In addition, the role of advisor and expert is raised, and contrasted to the introverted scholar image. One of the few totally unclassifiable responses which was placed with these 'Other' themes was the reply: "a top sportsman." Occasionally, it may have been that a respondent merely made the first comment which occurred to him, but the many subsequent questions on traits of the intellectual helped clarify vague and irrelevant first reactions.

Eleven respondents, for example, immediately said they didn't know what an intellectual was, and refused at that point to suggest

traits. In some cases probative techniques resulted in truculence, in other cases there seemed no ready referent to the label 'intellectual'.

Initial reactions to the label of the social type are similar to the findings of Mead and Metraux and of Beardslee and O'Dowd in their respective studies of scientists⁷--committed to his work, which is abstract and difficult, but for which he has trained extensively and continues to read to keep up-to-date; sometimes opinionated, sometimes reticent and often unable to relate to others as an average person, a little bit removed from the normal in cultural tastes and level of conversation. There are more comments about the "in-puts" of ideas and knowledge in discussions of intellectuals at the outset of our questions, than there are statements of his contributions to the worlds of science and art.. "outputs" are not immediately considered. It is notable that the initial reaction to "intellectual" is an attempt to describe the amount of innate intelligence, the process of seeking after knowledge, and of working for and with ideas. These are the public's first criteria, then, and the occupational roles and social goals pursued by intellectuals are perceived as secondary to the knowledgeability and scholarship of the social type.

Evidence was gathered in this study of the physical image of the so-called "intellectual". Respondents were asked to describe John Doe, a typical intellectual. Twenty-eight, or 40%, would not give any physical description--some saying that intellectuals were any and all types of physiques.

A man in his late fifties, Heights resident:
 "I don't visualize a guy with a great big high brow; he could look like anybody, be nondescript in appearance."

A woman of thirty, Flats resident:
 "It doesn't matter. He could be a puny little thing and still have more brains than Cassius Clay."

A woman in her late thirties, Heights resident:
 "I don't have to give the stereotype of tall, thin man with glasses, slightly balding---I don't believe it."

Yet, overwhelmingly among those thirty respondents who do have a mental picture of the physical appearance of an 'intellectual', it is this stereotype which is reported. The thin, bespectacled, mature sort, unathletic, somewhat tweedy, stooped and serious-looking; the description is not far removed from Ichabod Crane,⁸ though there are over-tones of F. Scott Fitzgerald and of Bertrand Russell. If there are occasional glimpses of John F. Kennedy, more often the picture is like Robert Stanfield.

A woman in her early twenties, Flats resident:
 "Sort of lean and thinly built, very tall, with glasses. . This is a stereotype perhaps. Very serious. ."

A woman in her late forties, Flats resident:
 "Slight frame, quiet manner, mature."

A man in his late thirties, Heights resident:
 "Depends on who's describing him--if it's an average person, you assume it's not a flattering term, meaning a bookwormish person. Mr. Hooke's phrase was 'pervert'."⁹

A man in his mid-forties, Heights resident:
 "No image of what he'd look like. First thought--horn-rimmed glasses and would read a lot. Second thought--he wouldn't have to be. . Tall, slim, slightly balding, probably."

A woman in her mid-forties, Flats resident:
 "He wouldn't have to be a tall man, of any build and feature. Usually is bespectacled; someone that dresses neatly. You can't pick him out by looks."

A man in his late fifties, Heights resident:
 "I think physically, he'd be six feet, weigh
 190 pounds, be of straight and upright character,
 pleasant gait and manner. A pleasant approach to
 everyone. A magnetic personality that would
 attract you in a hotel lobby. He'd command respect."

A man, in his early thirties, Heights resident:
 "Tall, heavy glasses, dressed in tweeds, with a
 moustache or a beard."

A woman in her mid-twenties, Flats resident:
 "A stuffed shirt maybe, or a bookworm. . . Not the
 athletic type."

A woman in her late forties, Heights resident:
 "Not a long hair, but a history professor type.
 Interested more in books than everyday goings on. Not
 the athletic type too often, too busy with books; yet
 some busy with athletics."

A woman in her mid-twenties, Flats resident:
 "Usually British-looking, with long hair and bulky
 sweaters."

In these responses, the social typing process is highly obvious in the phrases selected, in the contrasting of stereotypes: "a stuffed shirt maybe, or a bookworm". The ascetic imagery is there, but balanced by the comfortable tweedy imagery, and some hints of charisma and popular adulation. Orrin Klapp had not used 'intellectual' as the referent in his study, but 'brain', and found a similar cluster of descriptions: as Einstein was called "brain, genius, character, highbrow, egghead, crackpot."¹⁰ An ingredient of amused tolerance of the 'character' is evident: "long hair and bulky sweaters". The respect is verbalized rather rarely, more often is hidden behind descriptions like "quiet manner, mature" or "straight and upright character". Yet it is not flattering to call a North American male "bookwormish", and the austere and the slight descriptions abound, reminiscent of the stereotypes described by Leo Gurko in American

films and novels.¹¹ He is rarely described as exciting in appearance by our respondents:

A woman in mid-forties, Heights resident:
 "He's rather dull, not easy to meet. Farmerish in his dress, kind of sloppy. No build is characteristic."

A woman in her early fifties, Heights resident:
 "Average rather pale-looking, no personality (in general terms not comparative)."

A man in his early forties, Flats resident:
 "Maybe he looks like Dief. Lots are phony: an announcer had a heavy voice, seemed like a heavy guy and black bearded, but not so."

A woman in early twenties, Flats resident:
 "A moustache, great big stomach. He'd sit behind a desk and talk all day."

As Withey had pointed out about his study of attitudes toward scientists on the surface, respondents are supportive, but probing elicits perceptions of less appealing characteristics.¹² In the representative statements quoted above, a vast range of physical and personality types are perceived as typical of intellectuals. And other respondents had not commented because they felt that intellectuals look like anyone else, in the variety of shapes and sizes that most men come in. Were intellectuals perceived as the same as non-intellectuals in other ways, or were they somehow "special"? Early in the series on questions about intellectuals, this was raised.

Are intellectuals "special"? Yes, to nearly half of the seventy respondents, they are better than the average. Thirty-three (47%) described the superior intellect, greater facility with words and ideas, greater capacity for work and concentration of so-called intellectuals. Another nine said that they were not innately superior, but they did try harder, strive for more education, and keep their goals in mind.

Ten per cent of the respondents perceived intellectuals as "special" in a peculiar way: "nuttier", they "have a quirk, something that's odd". For them, intellectuals are not to be trusted, and a theme appears which will be more evident in the anti-intellectual questions: intellectuals can be immoral and subversive.

Thus, for various reasons, 49 of the respondents believe that there is something special about the intellect, application of talent, or even emotional make-up of men of ideas. For 16 respondents, there is nothing "special" about intellectuals, they are just like everybody else, and very ordinary in all ways. For some of these, people are people and the concept intellectual is almost an accidental label. It may have been too, that some of the sixteen wanted to sound magnanimous, unprejudiced even toward persons with extensive education, etc. Only five could not decide whether or not they viewed the intellectual as somehow "special".

Academic Sub-group's Definition

Before leaving the general traits of intellectuals for specific details of their perceived occupations and social goals, it is pertinent to report the reactions of the academic sub-group to the first question on intellectuals. The seventeen professors selected for this control group of intellectuals had been informed of the topic, and hence, the question "what does the label bring to your mind?" did not strike them unaware.

Overwhelmingly, the academics responded in terms of the interests, goals and values category, with secondary references to education, occupation and expertise. The professors answered in terms of the value intellectuals place on ideas as the basic stimulus to their

various possible roles: contemplator, researcher, reformer, expert. Eleven of the seventeen men stressed "concern with ideas", three perceived intellectuals as specialist-authorities, one discussed the superiority of their thought-processes, and two used examples of intellectuals to answer the question.¹³

A humanities professor in his early fifties:

"It has two connotations: somebody who has a serious continuous concern with ideas; and this is associated with wide reading and the desire to discuss and argue about philosophical, political, cultural matters."

A physical scientist in his early fifties:

"Call him an egghead. . I suppose a person whose thought processes on the average are higher than for the average of the population. He requires and uses information--of all sorts that bear on thought--not normally available to the population."

A humanities professor in his late thirties:

"An intellectual is somebody in any profession who accords to the life of the mind a primary role. The outlook on human life is most important. A mathematician, insurance company man, an actor--he doesn't have to be a professional."

An applied social scientist in his late thirties:

"The term means a person who's interested in ideas. . who's able to get away from immediate circumstances and hypothesize other ways of doing things, other realities. It has nothing to do with formal occupation: a job may require intelligence but the person may not be an intellectual."

A social scientist in his mid-thirties:

"The stereotyped negative reaction is he's effeminate, out of contact, interested in thinking not doing. My view is somebody committed to the world of ideas--not necessarily in a non-empirical way. He works at knowing himself and the world about him; has commitment to battle against ignorance. He's not happy with knowledge of the status quo."

The similarity between some of these responses and the definitions quoted earlier by respondents perceiving 'scholarly interests or values' is evident. For instance, the common phrase "who's

interested in ideas", the recurrent emphasis on wide-reading, a questioning mind, and discussion of cultural matters. Similarly, the comment on "thought processes. . . higher than for the average" recalls the perceptions of the way that intellectuals are "special". And the level of his knowledge, "not normally available to the population" was a theme of many who stressed the superior education and training of the so-called intellectual. Evidence is given that the academics are quite aware of the negative stereotype of the intellectual, and a later question was included in their interviews to probe their views on the general public image of the intellectual. That will be discussed later with the anti-intellectual data.

The definitions of the intellectual of such historians of the social type as Lewis Coser and Richard Hofstadter are closely resembled in some of the above comments of the professors. They do seem to represent the intellectual's self-concept, of a person "who accords to the life of the mind a primary role," who "works at knowing himself and the world about him". What matters is not what his job is, or what his level of status is, the important thing is his "outlook", his "serious continuous concern with ideas". Eleven of the seventeen used a viewpoint very similar to Hofstadter's.¹⁴

Perceived Social Position

From the general profile of intellectual traits, we turn to the specific questions of social position and occupations of so-called intellectuals. The second question formulated in the theoretical chapter asked "What social position are intellectuals perceived to occupy?" What careers were perceived and what power was attributed to intellectuals? Respondents were asked to name the fields of

employment of intellectuals, and by their responses, we see the pattern of organizational affiliation.

Very few respondents perceived the intellectual as actively employed in the cultural area of 'the arts'--creative writing, art, music, drama, museum-work. So creativity is not necessarily perceived to go along with intellectualism, at least in occupations.

Similarly, few perceived the intellectual to be funded from such private sources as family estates, foundation grants and so on. The intellectual was not conceived of as a gentleman scholar who did not have to work. Most were perceived to be employed at the upper-middle-class status level, in the academic institutions: universities or public schools. The legal and medical professions and the clergy made up another large group of answers to the anticipated areas of intellectual employment.

Academe--teaching, university	16
Cultural sphere--the arts	5
Professions or white collar	19
General elite	5
Any job at all, unimportant	10
Other, don't know	14

Ten persons commented that the intellectual could be found in any employment, that his daily work was not necessarily of relevance to his mental interests. But most of the respondents perceived that the intellectual was gainfully employed in an organization or profession, so that generally his status would be middle class. No longer is the typical intellectual the struggling poet or playwright, or the crusading newspaper editor, but rather he is the laboratory scientist or the professor of history, and sometimes he is perceived to be the family doctor, or the social worker.

A list of careers had been handed to respondents, with the instruction to state which they felt were really intellectual occupations. What is most interesting about the results of the list of careers, is that those chosen most frequently were those which have been researched, described and cited as the modern intellectual prototypes: the scientist, the professor, the philosopher, and the writer. Respondents selected careers as follows:¹⁵

	Total Choices	(Stated Doubts)
Scientist	44	(6)
Professor	41	(6)
Philosopher	35	(3)
Writer	34	(9)
Editor	32	(0)
Doctor	30	(5)
Social Worker	19	(3)
School Teacher	16	(5)
Politician	16	(6)
Artist	15	(3)
Banker	11	(2)
Industrialist	10	(1)
Electrical Engineer	8	(1)
Salesman	5	(2)

Of the seventy respondents, 44 named the Scientist as a career in which one would find many intellectuals, while six of those who mentioned Scientist expressed some doubts that all persons in this category would be intellectuals. It is notable that the Doctor is named twice as often as the Artist--perhaps because the public views the medical man as an expert who should be highly knowledgeable, but this is not essential for an artist. The largest number of doubts were expressed over the Writer, with such comments as "some are, some aren't", and no reservations were expressed about the Editor. Some of the questions probably reflect the respondent's uncertainty as to whether the career really does have intellectuals in it, for example

the Politician, which prompted "well, Pearson is but Manning isn't". In addition to these names, "Lawyer" was mentioned by two, and "Even a plumber could be one" by one respondent.

After considering this list, respondents may have built a 'set' which led them to name professionals and academics on the later open-ended question. The trend in both cases, is to perceive the intellectual as employed in highly trained, abstract and highly verbal careers, more than the helping professions, and least often in commerce and industry.

Seymour Lipset's definition of intellectuals as "creators, distributors and appliers of knowledge" is implied here.¹⁶ Our respondents acknowledge the scientific, philosophic and literary 'creators' of knowledge more than the artistic as appropriate intellectuals. But they are not as likely to credit a 'distributor' who teaches young children as at the intellectual level that a professor in university would be. Appliers of knowledge like doctors and social workers are included, but electrical engineers may be too little known to respondents for legitimation as intellectuals.

Lipset had to admit, the important element was not the career of the intellectual, but the pursuit of ideas itself. Clearly, our respondents also placed the man of ideas--scientific or humanist--in the top five choices.

The control group of academics were not given the list of careers as above, but rather were asked specifically which areas of the academic sphere they felt had highest concentrations of intellectuals. Many of them spoke in terms of subject departments within the University of Alberta at the time. First mentioned were the

'humanities', by nine, which included the classics, the social sciences and the literary arts. Second, they named 'both arts and sciences', six stating that there were as many intellectuals in physics and biology as in literature or philosophy. Third, five restricted their comments to the sciences, but several excluded the technical professions which relate to the sciences such as engineering. A few refused to commit themselves to any field, saying that there were intellectuals in all departments at any given time. The academics generally did not feel that intellectuals were concentrated in the 'training' faculties of commerce, education or medicine. They too stressed the abstract and creative departments.

It might be pointed out that visibility may play a part in the occupational perceptions we have discussed. In Edmonton, the university is highly visible, and the immediate referent for a citizen thinking of the site for an intellectual career. University training is obvious to the lowest-educated citizen who sends his children to a school, who visits a doctor or a lawyer, or who is visited by a social worker. Less visible to the public are the cultural and artistic occupations, and the discrepancy between the academic's inclusion of artistic intellectuals and the public's exclusion of them could be a matter of familiarity and visibility. If the knowledge of a social world is revealed by the knowledge of the social types within it,¹⁷ then the academic inclusion of artistic intellectuals might indicate that the intellectual self-image includes the creative rather than the trained. The Heights and Flats respondents, however, seemed to equate an occupation which required university-training with intellectualism.

The Goals and Values of Intellectuals

Research question number three had asked what goals and values are attributed to intellectuals. Chapter II discussed the statements of the historians of intellectualism that the pursuit of knowledge itself was the main goal, displacing the more common social stress on wealth and status. Some of the research into the image of the scientist portrayed them as seeking 'the answers', or practical discoveries of cures and solutions to societal ills, and sometimes seeking fame, power, wealth.¹⁸

In the interview schedule, respondents were asked what they thought that intellectuals were working toward. Replies were categorized as follows:

Social improvement	34	(48.6%)
Personal fulfillment	14	(20.0)
Status, wealth	12	(17.1)
Variety of goals	10	(14.3)

As usual, we will deal here with the general profile of response, and will present the discussion of the Flats and Heights sub-groups in Chapter VI.

Partly because of the wording of the question, many respondents answered in the general terms of 'societal improvement'. They perceived the intellectuals' main goal was--and the question was not worded as what it should be--working to make a better future for humanity by solving problems, finding cures and passing on their knowledge. At times there is an element of cynicism in the responses, that the ideal goal should be such 'societal improvement', but that selfish motives are involved too.

A woman in her mid-twenties, Heights resident:
 "Guess, a better life for mankind, that would be what they'd tell you."

A woman in her early fifties, Heights resident:
 "In their minds, to better the country. They have ability and would take the time to do it. Average wouldn't."

A woman in her late thirties, Heights resident:
 "Suppose a better understanding of all the problems we're confronted with--their solutions."

A man in his early forties, Flats resident:
 "Schweitzer--worked for humanity all his life."

A woman in her mid-sixties, Flats resident:
 "For doing good, being helpful. What they should be. . . I don't know, you'd almost have to watch their careers."

A man in his early thirties, Heights resident:
 "They themselves probably feel they're doing it for the good of the culture, of the community. But it's for their own gratification."

A woman in her mid-thirties, Heights resident:
 "Scientist doesn't work for humanity for destruction. For knowledge, to improve living conditions and everything."

As we have said, some of the answers were sincerely given as the highest social goals for improving humanity's future. Clearly, these respondents believe that the intellectual has an obligation to use his talents for direct social benefit. In such an expression, a basic cultural value is evident, that our goals should be toward collective improvement of our life-state. If the image of the intellectual is of a person with the best brains, the best education and opportunity for study, then respondents who are thinking of the ideal might see him working for the highest goals of service.

Krohn has argued that there has been a change in scientific values which includes a social orientation rather than a discovery-orientation.

"A change from the justification of research by the value of knowledge for its own sake to its justification by its utility in the achievement of general human welfare."¹⁹

We have documented that the generalized intellectual is also perceived by 34 of our 70 respondents to be pursuing whatever will improve human welfare. But the value of knowledge for its own sake is still considered to be the intellectual's goal by 14 of the respondents.

The category called 'personal fulfillment' covers the perception of the so-called intellectual playing with ideas for his interest and amusement, and of his being driven by a need to know. The answers range in their articulation of this goal from an emphasis on the personal satisfaction an intellectual might find from his knowledge, to the acquisition of knowledge so that he may better understand his environment.²⁰

A man nearing twenty, Heights resident:
"To gather and learn as much as they can about this world. Want as much knowledge as possible."

A woman in her mid-thirties, Heights resident:
"Improving their mind even more, broadening minds and being more sympathetic, tolerant to other people."

A woman in her early thirties, Flats resident:
"Knowledge, I would say."

A woman in her mid-forties, Heights resident:
"Sincere ones, I suppose, toward happiness and contentment for themselves."

A man in his early twenties, Heights resident:
"For himself, understanding for self. Depending on ultimate aim--he'd work for that. Define it as searching for truth, order or reason."

A woman in her late thirties, Heights resident:
"Self-satisfaction, or satisfaction in his own field."

The themes mentioned in this perception of the intellectual's goal are internal, both cerebral and emotional--that there is satisfaction and

pleasure in sheer knowledge. This is the personal goal discussed by Hofstadter as the "sense of dedication to the life of the mind which is very much like a religious commitment."²¹ The pursuit of knowledge, defined as truth or order or reason, or even as continuous learning, becomes an end in itself. The understanding or the facts gained may later be put to social purpose, but in this view, the intellectual-goal is in the discovering. Some of the one-fifth of our respondents who state the personal fulfillment goal of the intellectual, could be familiar with the classic conception of the man of knowledge. Those who mention self-satisfaction and happiness may not have meant anything more than psychological security, but they have been included in this category for their emphasis on the internal rather than the external.

Twelve respondents declared that the intellectual was motivated for status, fame, money--the same as everybody else is. Some of them have been glimpsed already in those who saw social improvement as an ideal goal, but immediate financial gain as the real goal.

A man in his mid-fifties, Heights resident:
 "Humanity, maybe--it should be. I think it's money in their pockets."

A woman in her late thirties, Flats resident:
 "Themselves: for them, not me or you--the majority of them."

A woman in mid-thirties, Flats resident:
 "Same thing as everybody else, to make the best living they can. To better themselves too, some of them."

A man in his late twenties, Flats resident:
 "What do we all work for?--To get ahead."

A woman of thirty, Flats resident:
 "Something they want to get, and haven't, and never can get--to be famous."

A man in his late fifties, Flats resident:
 "Money, most of them. To better themselves in different ways of living."

In a culture where success is measured in socio-economic status, it is understandable that some respondents would attribute this common value to the so-called intellectual too. An additional consideration should be the link between the perceived employment of intellectuals with perceived goals. Most were considered to be in the professional occupations embracing science, universities, medicine, law and so on. These jobs are considerably better-paid than the wages gained by residents of the Flats, who are concentrated in the craftsman and production-jobs in the blue collar stratum. Therefore, if they think of intellectuals as university professors earning from ten to twenty thousand dollars a year,²² they might assume that money and prestige are basic intellectual goals.

Finally, one-seventh of the respondents considered that intellectuals are working for a variety of goals: personal satisfaction and societal improvement might be the primary goals, with secondary but definite admission of the importance of financial security.

A man in his mid-forties, Heights resident:
 "First, knowledge; second, humanity's future;
 third, self-improvement."

A woman in her early thirties, Heights resident:
 "Little of everything. Don't think money is the
 main thing, tho they may go along with it.
 Interested in furthering something."

A woman of twenty, Flats resident:
 "A lot are working toward money--others are trying
 to help. Same as anybody."

A man in his late fifties, Heights resident:
 "Furthering their knowledge. Wouldn't say seeking
 more gain--this comes automatically. Inventor
 doesn't seek gain and money. Similarly, an
 intellectual gets fame by reason of his contribution
 to society."

A man in his mid-fifties, Flats resident:
 ". . . Lot for fame, a lot for money. Some
 couldn't care less about money--there are a few
 of those."

A woman in her early thirties, Heights resident:
 "Not usually financial. Trying to improve both
 themselves and the world. Many original ideas, and
 they're trying to be distinct."

Clearly there are two themes in these replies: intellectuals can be striving toward a wide variety of goals, as wide a spectrum as would be found with non-intellectuals. Secondly, intellectuals might be observed to pursue a variety of goals taken altogether, but these are arranged in a different order of priority than goals of non-intellectuals. These respondents seem to say that status is, as one young woman put it: "a by-product."

The following chapter will further discuss the traits of the respondents who viewed intellectuals in the preceding ways. Education and the respondents' own socio-economic status will be considered. If the arguments of Hofstadter and Lasch are correct, that American businessmen have been most distrustful of the intellectual,²³ then we might discuss whether the upper white collar and professional people of the Heights are less likely to view the 'societal improvement' goal as most important. They may stress the 'personal fulfillment' goals of intellectual out of a denial that men of ideas are working for humanity's future benefit.

In sum, we might conclude the following from the respondents' statements about the goals of intellectuals. It is felt that intellectuals should be working for the highest development and improvement of the society, and to some extent their goal is human betterment, but they are not selfless. And thus, many intellectuals are perceived as working

for their own satisfaction primarily, solving problems because they are curious to find out the solutions, and because they find intrinsic pleasure in knowledge. When it comes to concrete success-goals, respondents perceive that a small proportion of intellectuals really do not care about money or prestige, that others will consider it a goal which is of less importance to the other goals, and that a good number of intellectuals are overtly or covertly working toward fame, money and all the other success-goals. Respondents say that the goal to which intellectuals would admit officially would be to bettering the human condition by applying their knowledge toward solving vital problems and raising the quality of life around them.

Attitudes toward Intellectuals

Distrust toward the so-called intellectual was documented in Chapter II, in the antagonism shown toward intellectuals in public media, in witch-huntings described by Hofstadter in his book, and in other works citing the stereotypes held in North American society toward men of ideas.²⁴ As was mentioned in Chapter II, a number of questions were asked in the interview to probe the attitudes respondents held toward the intellectual. Here we shall briefly summarize the sentiments found, illustrating them with quotations from the interviews. We will discuss praise, indifference, ambivalence, and negative attitudes toward so-called intellectuals. The intellectual is sometimes Hero, sometimes Villain and Fool.

First, the positive feelings expressed in praise of intellectuals reflect feelings of awe and respect toward the brilliant and creative person, as well as satisfaction at the contribution he makes to social life. Just as 'praise' itself means both to extol, commend

and applaud and to glorify by ascription of perfections,²⁵ so respondents both expressed approval and idealized intellectuals. The interview questions we shall consider asked what kinds of intellectuals they respected, what some good and bad traits of intellectuals were, and what distinguished real from phony intellectuals.

A woman in her late thirties, Heights resident:
 "I'm in awe. . . Respect all intellectuals that make good use of what they have--use brain to fullest extent."

A woman in her late thirties, Flats resident:
 "Sure admire those who stick up for the individual, I think too few do. . . Should be more individuality."

A woman in her early twenties, Flats resident:
 "I don't know any bad things about them."

A man in his late fifties, Heights resident:
 "Intellectual that I would respect is knowing that he is an intellectual to begin with, is humble about it. If sincere and genuine honesty, yet a giant of strength and rock of Gibraltar in the community, a man you could depend on."

A woman in her late thirties, Heights resident:
 "Usually respect them very highly, am rather in awe of them. Certainly it would be to an intellectual I'd go if I wanted his opinion. Really can't think of any I wouldn't like."

A woman in her mid-sixties, Flats resident:
 "Any person that is doing a good service to their country, not selfish, just out for others--that's one."

A man in his mid-thirties, Flats resident:
 "I respect all intellectuals--i.e., what in my opinion is an intellectual."

A woman in her mid-twenties, Heights resident:
 "They're a good example to all. Acquiring more and more knowledge is a real asset and would possibly stimulate others to have a greater interest in improving their intellect."

The label has conjured up in some respondents an idealized person who doesn't have any bad traits and is worthy of the highest respect if he qualifies for the label, an intellectual. As mentioned

above, some of the praise is directed to the example he set, the good works he is expected to carry out for society. The Positive stereotype of the scientist which Mead and Metraux derived is recalled:

He knows his subject. .does not jump to conclusions, and stands up for his ideas even when attacked. . . . He is a dedicated man who works not for money or fame or self-glory but, like Madame Curie, Einstein, Oppenheimer, Salk--for the benefit of mankind and the welfare of his country. . . The future rests on his shoulders.²⁶

The intellectual too is a Hero if he is honest, sincere, humble, reliable, brilliant, unselfish, wise and authoritative--an example to all. Yet this adulation, approval and prestige is like the top of an iceberg, it is the official image which hides greater threats below the surface. An indicator might be the cryptic qualifier quoted above "what in my opinion is an intellectual." Or in this seemingly positive view:

"The really intellectual person wouldn't have too many bad things. There are all kinds of intellectuals, good and bad, and if they do do something bad, they don't deserve the intellectual label."

Before exploring some of the things which are considered bad, and which lose the praise and respect evident here, we shall consider expressions of indifference. There are a small number of respondents, 14, to whom the questions on intellectuals were unimportant and irrelevant, they simply didn't concern themselves with these people, and expressed indifference on these attitude questions. Most of these were residents of the Flats, who said they didn't know enough about 'the intellectual' to have an attitude.

A woman in her early thirties, Heights resident:
"Never really thought about it--or them."

A man in his early forties, Flats resident:
"Guess they've got a job to do, just the same as we have."

A man in his mid-twenties, Flats resident:
 "I've got nothing against them."

A woman in her mid-forties, Flats resident:
 I don't stop to think about these things."

A woman in her mid-forties, Flats resident:
 "How can you answer when you don't know them personally? I've no comment."

A man in his mid-twenties, Flats resident:
 "I don't disrespect anybody; respect everybody."

One cannot know if some of these ostensibly indifferent respondents do have feelings toward the so-called intellectual which they were not willing to express. Knowing that the educated and creative man is considered valuable and prestigious in this society, undoubtedly some were careful not to seem biased against men of knowledge.

However, some expressed ambivalence--contradictory attitudes of approval and disapproval, and some fluctuation between their feelings. It would be simplistic to tally the number of respondents who named both 'good traits' and 'bad traits' of intellectuals, and call them all ambivalent. But we shall restrict the ambivalent category to only those who seem torn between positive and negative attitudes. Many of the replies were lengthy, as though the respondents were arguing with themselves about which view they held.

A woman in her mid-forties, Flats resident:
 ". .Don't think I disrespect anyone unless it's some who're morally wrong. I think there are 'crazy eggheads' in every walk of life, and also the opposite."

A man in his late fifties, Heights resident:
 (Bad) "Intellectuals being human beings could be that while they're clever, they could divert their knowledge toward self-gain. Could hurt a lot of people.
 (Good). .Just the opposite--they'd exercise knowledge for the betterment of mankind. If genuine, sincere intellectuals were to band together, could do good. Intellectuals are influential, known, their influence on the general public is tremendous."

A woman of twenty, Flats resident:

"I'd respect those trying to do some good.
The ones I wouldn't care about are causing trouble
(in Quebec, separatists.)"

A woman in her early thirties, Flats resident:

"I respect those teaching in educational fields. .
Some I have doubts about, for example politics. I
don't know, you get all kinds in there."

A woman in her mid-thirties, Heights resident:

"Perhaps they are too much to themselves, not out-
going enough to community. They put forth thoughts
and ideas, some are worth considering, some aren't.
Respect the ones that are true, as such. Don't respect
the ones that pretend to be so--a lot of phony ones."

A woman in her early twenties, Flats resident:

"I respect the fact they've got the know-how to get
where they are, disrespect some for the way they got
there."

A woman in her mid-fifties, Flats resident:

(Bad) "Letting the Communists get a hold--too many are
in here and have too much to say. (Good) Don't know,
except they're really trying, speaking their minds,
trying to better our country."

These fascinating points of view express not only a mixture of attitudes and feelings about the intellectual, but also a variety of prescriptions on an Activity dimension: what he does and does not do which annoys these respondents. The intellectual is vulnerable for keeping too much to himself and not sharing his wisdom, and is also criticized if he forces himself on other people, and tries to impress his views on them; yet he is criticized for letting people with Communistic views have their say. He is working for the country, yet he must be watched in case he diverts energy for self-gain; he must work for people and never use them.

Another theme which is evident by now is a Morality dimension, with the concern that intellectuals have enough knowledge to be treacherous, and respect accorded to them could be disastrous if they

are morally suspect, or politically traitorous. We have tapped the two anti-intellectual strains in this data: there is concern that the intellectual isn't energetically contributing to society, and there is a risk that he will be a disciple of Satan, not of God.

Turning to the few responses which are avowedly anti-intellectual in attitude, still with regard to questions of respect-disrespect and good-bad traits, we find reluctance to express great hostility.

A woman in her late thirties, Heights resident:
 "I'm just not for them. Don't respect anything of them. (Good) Don't know if there is one, is there?"

A woman in her mid-forties, Heights resident:
 (Bad) "The worst thing is their atheistic views.
 (Good) Hard to say. Don't really think they accomplish much for society as a whole. Essential for every walk of life. In Canada they're not contributing to the moral standard of the nation at all."

A woman of thirty, Flats resident:
 (Bad) "Snobbish. . (Good) Don't know if there's any good intellectuals. . Like the friendlier ones if there is any. Disrespect ones that don't speak to you, think they're something they're not."

A woman in her mid-twenties, Flats resident:
 (Bad) "Think they spend too much money doing nothing and a lot take too much time not doing things that should be done. Hawrelak going on trips around the world. . . (Good) All depends again on who we're talking about; for example Kennedy did some good things."

There is a generalized resentment of the elite status of the so-called intellectual among these and others expressing negative views. The resentment is not totally from lower class residents of the Flats, either. There seems a theme of their being societal takers, rich and educated but not really doing anything for the rest of us. Secondly, the suspicion of immorality is again present-- they're unbelievers and a bad example, not trying to teach proper living. The "not doing things that should be done" recalls the impractical or ineffectual stereotype

which Gurko found in mid-cult literature.²⁷

The man of ideas, in some configurations, is a dried-out, bookish, nearsighted stick, but in others he is seductive, dangerous, full of worldly temptations. . . . His most potent shape has been the Devil, and the Devil, in nearly all versions, has been intellectually superior to God. . . . The struggle between them is posed in terms of the struggle between morality and brains, these two elements being conceived as not only separable but antagonistic. . . . Side by side with being a dull impractical fellow, the man of ideas is also presented as dangerous and intellectually seductive. In this second role wickedness and a rebellious spirit cling to him in about equal measure.²⁸

The arguments of Chapter II will be recalled, that it is the pragmatic philosophy of America which has made the man of ideas seem ineffectual and rather useless in day-to-day living. At the same time, it is the religious fundamentalism and morality outlined by Hofstadter that is related to the view of intellectuals as immoral and subversive.²⁹ The two stereotypes do appear to exist side by side in those respondents in this study who showed ambivalence or negative feelings. The man of ideas may be inactive and ineffectual, living in an ivory-tower world and not contributing his mental or physical energy; or if he is perceived as active, he must be watched, for he could be immoral or treacherous, using his superior knowledge for the 'wrong' ends.

However, we must remember the numbers of respondents whose replies are ambivalent, or indifferent. The intensity of anti-intellectualism is not great--when people stop to think about the so-called intellectual, they are both vaguely contemptuous and suspicious of him. But unless they are living close to the social world of the intellectual--which they attribute to the university and professional fields--they rarely brush shoulders with examples of this social type, and rarely formulate their feelings toward him.

The other side of the stereotype are those respondents who praise and idealize the so-called intellectual until he not only resembles 'super-brain' but is the highest example of purity, honesty, unselfishness and humility, almost a 'super-citizen', working only for the societal good. He inspires awe in his admirers, who admit that he is rare, because anyone who exhibits weaknesses or selfish traits is no longer considered in the intellectual class, they restrict the category to the heroic, brilliant ones.

With the background of attitudes toward the man of ideas, we shall turn to a couple of questions which will reveal something of the perceived functions of intellectuals, and their inter-personal relations.

Respondents were asked to express an opinion about this statement "It is the job of professors, writers and other intellectuals to comment on and criticize our society." It was analyzed in terms of the respondents' agreement or disagreement with it. Responses of our sample of seventy citizens were as follows:

General agreement.....	29	(41.4%)
Qualified agreement.....	17	(24.3%)
Indifferent, other.....	4	(5.7%)
Disagreement.....	20	(28.6%)

Just over 40% are in approval, that intellectuals should be commentators and critics--as we shall see, some agreed because they feel that these people are best qualified to comment on the society, while others agreed because they feel that everyone, including intellectuals, has the right to criticize. Just under a quarter of the respondents would approve cautiously, with such qualifications as, "If their criticism is constructive"--indicating their suspicion that the critic-role might not be beneficial. Very few respondents did not express either agreement

or disagreement, and the four who were indifferent may represent the hard core of citizens who are completely ignorant of this social type. Nearly thirty per cent of the respondents felt that the so-called intellectual had no right to criticize the society, for reasons which varied from concern with this role, to concern with criticism itself. To illustrate the respondents who Agreed generally, we quote:

A woman in her early twenties, Flats resident:
 "Agree. Think they're probably best qualified in Canada. Can poke fun at things we think serious. Perhaps give suggestions for changing things."

A woman in her late thirties, Heights resident:
 "They're as entitled as anybody else--still individuals and human beings. Not more their job than others, unless they know something we don't."

A man in his mid-forties, Heights resident:
 "I would think they'd do a better job than a lot of people who have ulterior motives."

A woman in her mid-twenties, Flats resident:
 "Yes, their job alright--because they can get away with it."

A woman in her mid-thirties, Flats resident:
 "Everybody can criticize. The more you understand, the more right, the more able you are to talk about it."

There is a tendency for agreement to be based on the right of any citizen to criticize, and very little mention of comment and criticism as the role of the intellectual. Again, the idealization appears in the response which assumes that intellectuals do not have ulterior motives. Yet there is also a hint of the privileges that come with the high status of intellectuals--'they can get away with it'.

Less optimism characterizes the respondents who give Qualified Agreement:

A woman in her mid-twenties, Heights resident:
 "Providing their criticism is correct. The more criticism we get the farther we can get, the better we develop. . . Shouldn't be criticizing if they don't know."

A man in his early forties, Heights resident:
 "To me, criticism is condemnation. If criticizing what's there, they should offer some solution to the problem. Part of professional upbringing is to create something different from what is here."

A woman in her mid-sixties, Flats resident:
 "If they feel that things by their suggestions or ideas could better anything--like that, I say yes."

A woman in her early fifties, Heights resident:
 "Up to a certain point, when they pull something fancy like at University over electing Mayor Hawrelak--they acted like kids. Should be able to speak their minds but a time and place for such things."

As mentioned above, the caution expressed by these who somewhat agree that the intellectual should comment and criticize, is toward making valuable criticism. Over and over, respondents stress "they should criticize, but constructively"--inferring that criticism is perceived as condemnation. Intellectual criticism is expected to be responsible, positive and constructive--if not, it should not be made.

Finally, we turn to the representatives of the Disagreement viewpoint:

A man in his mid-thirties, Flats resident:
 "I disagree strongly. Definitely not. No more say than anybody else in things like that."

A woman in her early thirties, Heights resident:
 "It's up to them to try to improve it, I don't think commenting will. Don't think it's their job to criticize. Should try to improve it."

A woman in her early twenties, Flats resident:
 "No, I don't know. Don't feel they have the right to criticize. They believe one thing, others another---couldn't tell what others should do."

A man in his mid-twenties, Flats resident:
 "They have no right to criticize our society."

There is almost a feeling of outrage in some of these disagreements--respondents feel that the intellectual is grabbing for himself a right which is everyone's. Additionally, there is a strong sense of the

condemnation implicit in criticism, which is almost sacrilege, for it's our society.³⁰ Again, if the intellectual was perceived as someone whose role was the improvement of society, what business has he in denigrating it? Responses to this question raise implications for the further study of the intellectual social type, as will be discussed in the Conclusions.

Social criticism has been emphasized by intellectuals writing about their own role, and rebellion against the status quo has been the way that they have long resisted the homogenization of culture. Hofstadter quotes Irving Howe, who regretted the taming of intellectual criticism³¹ and historian Loren Baritz, who believed:

that 'any intellectual who accepts and approves of his society prostitutes his skills and is a traitor to his heritage.' He asked whether, 'by definition, a man of ideas must maintain the posture of the critic, and whether the intellectual who sincerely believes in and approves of the larger movements of his society can reconcile the demands of his mind and those of his society.'³²

Seen against the urgent support for intellectual criticism expressed here, the proportion of respondents who agree that there is a place for commenting and criticizing takes on another significance. They may be viewed as those in the society who recognize that the intellectual plays the role of societal conscience when he questions, makes fun of, or condemns occurrences. Those who disagree on the grounds that the so-called intellectual has no more right than anyone else to criticize, imply that he has been assimilated into the mainstream and should be a partisan of the central goals and attitudes of 'everyone'.

What did the interviews with the academic intellectuals reveal on this question of the criticism-role? There ought to be more agree-

ment if this has been considered a traditional part of the role. In fact, eleven of the seventeen academics agree with the statement, one 'heartily', others explaining that it is 'a legitimate responsibility of such people', and three stating it is only a 'partial function' of intellectuals. Three of the professors qualify their agreement, again on the theme that criticism should be constructive. Two are not indifferent, but express opinions in-between agreement or disagreement, one of them saying he does not like to put himself in the position of critic, because situations become delicate. Only one of the academics disagrees with the statement, and his grounds are the familiar 'not their job any more than anyone else's'.

The only additions to the points of view seen earlier are the academic reminders that the role of critic is not the only job of the intellectual. Thus, we shall restrict quotations to these comments:

An applied social scientist, in his mid-thirties:
 "I agree, but think this is only a partial description of the function of professors. In a financial position which uniquely enables criticism, they cannot rest on their oars. Intellectuals should do what they're paid to--add to new knowledge."

A biological scientist, in his late thirties:
 "It's a correct statement--but it may not be complete."

A social scientist, in his late thirties:
 "It could be expressed differently--I agree as far as it goes--but further comments. Professors and writers are not necessarily intellectuals, and there are other jobs too for intellectuals. I feel they ought to criticize strongly, but should not do that and nothing else."

Clearly, the responsibility is felt keenly that along with the obligation to correct social problems, the intellectual does have other things to do. We can infer from the first comment that his basic role is carrying on his mental work, whatever that is. But otherwise, the

academics feel as did the non-intellectual respondents, that generally it is a right or a responsibility of the intellectual to criticize his surroundings, with the reminder that his criticism should be designed to improve not denigrate.

Near the end of the interview, a question was asked which yielded some interesting responses on the interpersonal relations perceived of the so-called intellectual. Again, the question was in the form of a statement to which the respondents were to react: "It has been said that most intellectuals are lonely people. Do you think so? why or why not?"

We shall examine the categories used for this question in the light of their assumptions about not only the nature of the intellectual personality, but also for the role-perceptions involved. The findings were:

No, he has his work.....	24	(34.3%)
No, he communicates.....	17	(24.3%)
Neutral, don't know.....	7	(10.0%)
Yes, isolated career.....	12	(17.1%)
Yes, can't communicate....	10	(14.3%)

The responses can be dichotomized without regard to agreement or disagreement to those concerned with sociability and those concerned with mental work. Thus, 24 say that the intellectual is not lonely because he is so immersed in his brain-work, which gives him sufficient company. But 12 say that he is lonely because his work necessitates isolated immersion, and he lacks and misses human company. These respondents differ basically on the psychological effect of individualized, sometimes isolated, work--some perceive it as engrossing enough to substitute for people, while the others view it as frustrating and a barrier to interaction.

A woman of thirty, Flats resident:
 "I don't believe they are. If they're intelligent and discover something, they're happy in that. And they have homes and everything."

A man in his late thirties, Heights resident:
 "No, I think they're isolated, but this is a voluntary thing."

A man in his early forties, Heights resident:
 "Lonesome yes, but not lonely. Because the drive they have, it's not all-consuming, but precludes the necessity for company. An intellectual's a philosopher at all times."

A woman of twenty, Flats resident:
 "Some are lonely because they don't associate that much with people."

A woman in her late forties, Flats resident:
 "Yes, in a sense because they're so inner-bound. Anyone that's mentally involved, thinking for themselves, is looking inward not out. . . Writers, musicians, composers, artists--they've been lonely, because they're outstanding--they're not ordinary."

In Hofstadter's concluding chapter, "The Intellectual: Alienation and Conformity" he argues that "the alienation of the intellectual and the artist, long since a ponderable fact, was beginning to congeal into a sort of ideology"³³ in modern America. That withdrawal from the mediocrity of much of American life became nearly a cult in the face of the hostilities and stereotypes of businessmen and such portrayals as Gurko charted. The view of the intellectual engrossed in his thoughts or his research, which was drawn out in the above quotations on loneliness, reflects the conception of the intellectual as outsider. He is stuck away in his book-lined office, or in his sterile laboratory, pursuing ideas not people--and happy or frustrated because of this isolated work.

The second viewpoint has less to do with intellectual work pursuits, and more to do with the perceived sociability of so-called

intellectuals. Seventeen of the respondents say that the intellectual is not lonely because he has people around him--fellow intellectuals or family--with whom to communicate. But ten perceive the intellectual as unable to form friendships, and unable to find others of his calibre with whom to associate--so they say he is lonely.

A man in his early thirties, Heights resident:
 "Yes, there aren't enough people who share their thoughts and feelings to be very friendly with them. No one similar to associate with."

A woman in her late twenties, Heights resident:
 "No, because there are many more intellectuals in our society than we realize and they congregate."

A woman of thirty, Flats resident:
 "Yes, I guess they wouldn't want to be sociable with anybody else, or wouldn't know how."

A man in his early thirties, Flats resident:
 "I don't think so. They can communicate with everybody, or should be able to. If they cannot, not intellectual in all spheres of life."

A woman in her early twenties, Flats resident:
 "Don't really think they're lonely--must be at least one person they have some affection for. They would be satisfied if they came to visit."

This conception of the intellectual is even more basically related to his integration or alienation. We recall the portrayals of the intellectual physically, as someone preoccupied, using abstractions, severe, remote and somehow unapproachable. Yet the other side of the picture is on the considerate expert, someone everybody can depend on to give advice and solve problems; a warm, pipe-smoking, tweedy sort with a twinkle in his eye. Both of these conceptions exist, and both can be understood. As the North American intellectual has become the professional advisor to bureaucracies, has become more visible to the communities in which he works, he may have taken on more ordinary traits

--"they have homes and everything". And when these persons are viewed as professors of university, more or less collected in one place, the perception follows that "they congregate".

Coser raised the question in a sub-heading of his concluding chapter: "Absorption, Alienation, or Detached Concern?" wherein he argued that a degree of isolation and detachment is essential, as absorption would spell obsolescence.³⁴ While it is tragic to consider the intellectual as without "people who share their thoughts. . . to associate with", or so alienated that he "wouldn't know how" to communicate, the definition of a super-brain, a social idiot leads to such a viewpoint. Yet a total of 41 of our respondents consider that the intellectual need not be lonely, whereas 22 of them perceive the intellectual as a lonely person. He may be isolated or detached but he need not be alienated: his "detached concern"³⁵ keeps him involved.

Summary

In this chapter, we have considered the image of the intellectual as described in the interviews by respondents. A wide variety of definitions was discussed, relating to intelligence, educations, interests and status of so-called intellectuals. Physical descriptions were considered, and the perceived uniqueness of intellectuals was illustrated. The perceived occupational roles and affiliations were described, revealing that the respondents commonly considered intellectuals to be in academe as scientists or professors, or in standard professions. The goals attributed to men of ideas were reported, including their commitment to improving their society, to their personal satisfactions in "ideas for ideas' sake", and perceived status-seeking. Attitudes: positive, negative and ambivalent, were discussed

in relation to particular questions in the interview. The evidence for anti-intellectualism was ambivalence, with superficial politeness and rare hostility. The themes of activity and morality were traced in attitude considerations.

Questions representative of the perceived function of intellectuals as critics, and of their interpersonal involvement or loneliness concluded the chapter. The variety of perceptions and assumptions about the nature of intellectualism was expressed in respondents' statements.

While the imagery about the so-called intellectual brought illustrations of the viewpoints of respondents in the Flats, the Heights, and the Academic sub-groups, this chapter did not quantify the findings. Chapter VI will consider basic differences between these samples, with the help of the Scores described earlier. Having looked at the image, we turn to the traits of the image-holders.

1. In Chapter III the content analysis procedure is discussed under the section "Analysis of Data", pp. 81-85, where the four subdivisions, 'intelligence', 'scholarly interests', 'wide knowledge' and 'status' are shown to have emerged.
2. Respondents will not be identified by interview number in all subsequent quotations, rather by sex, age, and location of residence in our low-middle-class or upper-middle-class areas. Verbatim responses are given, with pauses indicated; punctuation devised by the researcher.
3. Chapter II quoted Leo Gurko's Heroes, Highbrows and the Popular Mind (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, A Charter Book, 1962), in which he detailed the stereotype of the intellectual as bumbling, sexless, so absent-minded about social behavior as to be ludicrous.
4. Of the sixteen who described our social type in terms of 'intelligence', six had social class scores between four and eight points: "Low". Greater detail is presented in Chapter VI.
5. That is, respondents seemed aware that the intellectual was a type very worthy of their respect, and frequently they apologized for describing him as either an odd-ball, or beyond human foibles. Some of the subsequent quotations will illustrate this, they knew that superior intellect put the so-called intellectual beyond their own level, and yet they tried to imply he wasn't super-human.
6. First quoting Hofstadter, Anti-Intellectualism (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), p. 27; then Lewis Coser, Men of Ideas (New York: The Free Press, 1965), p. ix.
7. See Chapter II, discussing M. Mead and P. Metraux, "The Image of the Scientist among High-School Students: A Pilot Study", in B. Barber and W. Hirsch, eds., The Sociology of Science (New York: The Free Press, 1962), and D.C. Beardslee and D.D. O'Dowd, "The College Student Image of the Scientist" in the same volume.
8. Washington Irving described him this way: "He was tall, but exceedingly lank, with narrow shoulders, long arms and legs, hands that dangled a mile out of his sleeves, feet that might have served for shovels, and his whole frame most loosely hung together. His head was small, and flat at the top, with huge ears, large green, glassy eyes, and a long snip nose, so that it looked like a weather-cock perched upon his spindle neck to tell which way the wind blew." Quoted by Hofstadter, op. cit., p. 315. F. Scott Fitzgerald, however, was usually pictured as roustached, 'tweedy' and masculine-looking.

9. This respondent refers to one of Alberta's cabinet minister who took part in Legislature discussions of the dismissal of the teacher referred to in Chapter I. The Minister and one of the MLA's condemned all "intellectuals" as "moral perverts."
10. Orrin E. Klapp, Heroes, Villains, and Fools (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962), p. 12. He described in more detail his findings on the image of the 'brain', in his section on "winner" types of Heroes, p. 31.
 "Americans also call him genius, mastermind, Einstein, pundit (Sometimes professor, braintruster, intellectual, intelligent-sia, expoert, specialist). Even such lesser lights as quiz kid, panel-game expert, and commentator come in for their share of glory. Asked to name a brain, Americans overwhelmingly choose Einstein, though Werner Von Braun, Robert Oppenheimer, Leonardo da Vinci, Socrates, Webster, or Aristotle are often mentioned. My data show that intellect is highly esteemed by Americans. . . Contempt for dreamers, eggheads and crackpots is well known. But let the idea-man produce cures, bombs, and gadgets. . . and suddenly he is respected."
11. As Gurko had described, one film portrayed its anti-hero intellectual 'hero' as ". . . a thin, stooped, rather faded young man, with tortoise-shell glasses which he continually removes and puts on nervously. . . . His eye has a remote look, and the pallor of his skin indicates that his life has been led indoors. ." See footnote 94, of Chapter II for the full transformation into virile male.
12. Stephen Withey, "Public Opinion about Science and Scientists" in Barber and Hirsch, op. cit., surveyed Americans in a panel study reported in Chapter II. His respondents were ambivalent, but hid this mistrust under an official support for the scientist.
13. Comments to be quoted will be preceded by age and field of study, purposely vague so as to preserve anonymity.
14. Hofstadter's book had been issued earlier, in 1963, and was available in the university library, so that interested professors might have read it. However, Hofstadter's formulation of the intellectual as a man who lives for ideas, someone who has attitudes of playfulness and piety toward knowledge, would not have been their only source of a definition of the intellectual. We assume that a full-time professor today is aware of the label and the social type of the intellectual, whether or not he identifies himself as one.
15. Only one respondent did not want to answer the career question, and five perceived only one intellectual career. The modal numbers were four or five careers, named by twenty-five respondents, while twelve perceived over seven as appropriate to intellectuals. Fourteen careers were listed alphabetically and presented to the respondent on a card to read. While an interminable list might have been given, these were thought to include creative, disseminating

and applied fields, as well as such roles as politician and salesman to represent 'popularity jobs', and banker and industrialist to represent other 'elite' careers.

16. Seymour Martin Lipset, in Political Man (New York: Doubleday, 1960), p. 333, explains "there are two main levels: the hard core or creators of culture--scholars, artists, philosophers, authors, some editors, and some journalists; and the distributors--performers in the various arts, most teachers, most reporters. A peripheral group is composed of those who apply culture as part of their jobs--professionals like physicians and lawyers." We include professors with distributors, although Lipset includes scholars with creators, for it is the professor's teaching function which makes him most visible to the public.
17. Orrin E. Klapp, Heroes, Villains and Fools, op. cit., p. 19.
18. Chapter II illustrates findings of Mead and Metraux, pp. 25-27, and of Stephen Withey, op. cit., pp. 27-28.
19. Roger G. Krohn, "The Institutional Location of the Scientist and his Scientific Values", IPE Transactions of the Professional Group on Engineering Management, Volume EM-8, No. 3 (September, 1961, p. 133.
20. The emphasis is on comprehension, not on changing the environment. The quest for knowledge, whether specific or general, is perceived to provide the intellectual with his greatest joy.
21. Hofstadter, op. cit., p. 27.
22. A question was included in the interview on the amount of money respondents felt typical intellectuals would make each year. This figure from \$10,000 to \$20,000 received the major consensus.
23. Hofstadter devotes an entire chapter of Anti-Intellectualism to the problems of business and intellect, op. cit., pp. 233-298. Christopher Lasch, The New Radicalism in America (1889-1963) (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1965) expresses the same theme, that businessmen have fought against all perceived radicalism by men of ideas.
24. In addition to Hofstadter, special attention was paid to Leo Gurko's vivid book, op. cit., cf. Chapter II.
25. Summarized from Webster's Third New International Dictionary, Unabridged Edition (Springfield, Mass.: G. and C. Merriam Co., 1967).
26. Mead and Metraux, op. cit., pp. 237-240.
27. Gurko, op. cit., summarized short stories from such mid-cult periodicals as The Saturday Evening Post, to document the stereotype he found, pp. 30-49, pp. 124-126.

28. Leo Gurko, op. cit., p. 50.
29. See greater discussion of this in Chapter II, pp. 59-60.
30. The last quotation represents this, a combination of insult at the idea that there is usurping of rights; and a deeper assumption that the ordinary people have stronger possession of the society than the outsider-intellectual. A 'we' - 'they' polarization occurs.
31. Hofstadter, op. cit., pp. 396-397, quotes Irving Howe's article, "This Age of Conformity", Partisan Review, Vol. XXI (January-February, 1954), pp. 7-33. Howe felt that intellectuals have become "responsible and moderate. And tame." Almost any alternative would be preferable to subordination of their talents to the uses of others: "A total estrangement from the sources of power and prestige, even a blind unreasoning rejection of every aspect of our culture, would be far healthier. ."
32. Howe's tradition of left-wing protest, according to Hofstadter, was carried on by Loren Baritz, in The Servants of Power (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965), quoted in Anti-Intellectualism, op. cit., p. 397.
33. Hofstadter, op. cit., p. 410.
34. Coser, Men of Ideas, op. cit., p. 358.
35. Coser uses this phrase of "detached concern" on page 360.

CHAPTER VI

ANALYSIS: THE IMAGE-MAKERS

"...it should be possible to contrast groups and even individuals within one language community for their ability to encode the same category."

- R.W. Brown and E.H. Lenneberg
"Studies in Linguistic Relativity"

This chapter will analyze the imagery of the intellectual discussed in Chapter V in terms of the characteristics of the sample of Edmontonians interviewed. Before describing their characteristics, and answering the research questions put in Chapter II, we shall reconsider the notion of 'social world',¹ a concept basic to the thesis problem.

In the Flats, we expected to find people of low socio-economic status and low-to-middle cultural interests, who have little familiarity with the so-called intellectual. In the Heights it was anticipated that respondents of high socio-economic status and middle-to-high cultural interests would have some familiarity with the intellectual. Among the small Academic group, partly because they were selected for intellectual fame,² we hoped to find high socio-economic status, high cultural interests, and a detailed familiarity with 'the intellectual'. These differences are referred to in this project as different 'social worlds', which should yield somewhat different definitions of 'the intellectual' in answer to Research Question Number One.

Each social world is a universe of regularized mutual response, an arena in which there is some kind of organization that facilitates anticipating the behavior of others. Each social world, then, is a culture area, the boundaries of which are set neither by territory nor formal group membership, but by the limits of effective communication.³

We assert, with Shibutani, that the sampling procedure allowed us to select sets of respondents whose social worlds were different "culture areas".

Independence of Samples by Social World

In order to test the basic problem of social world differences, we have now to show that the respondents sampled were indeed from different status and cultural groups. In addition to a description of the background data gathered from respondents, we can report statistical tests for the independence of samples which were applied to our ordinal indices. Since Edmonton is not a metropolitan city of vastly different sub-communities, it is necessary to caution that much more discrete sampling could have been done in Chicago or Toronto. However, as far as there are different social worlds in Edmonton, we have tried to utilize them.

The Mann-Whitney U test shows whether two samples represent populations which differ in central tendency--according to ordinal measurement. Siegal considers the Mann-Whitney U test "as a randomization test applied to the ranks of the observations".⁴ The U statistic shows the number of times a score in Group 2, in this case the Heights, precedes a score in Group 1, the Flats, in a total ranking. The scores to be analyzed were the ordinal ones devised for the project: the Social Class Score, the Media Exposure Score, the raw point-score of Media Quality, and the discarded Conservatism and Anti-Intellectualism Scores. Table V - 1 presents the statistical findings, that significance is exceedingly high, at the .00003 level, for all but the two opinion scores. It is probable that the assignment of ordinal points to the Anti-Intellectualism and Conservatism items violated the assumptions of the U test, for their individual items are different in kind as well as in quantity,

TABLE VI - 1

DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES BY MANN-WHITNEY U-TEST*

Variable	U Statistic	Z Values	Significance
Social Class Score (spread)	30.500	-6.858	.00003
Ranked Score	53.000	-7.030	.00003
Media Quality (points spread)	136.500	-5.591	.00003
Ranked Points	154.500	-5.490	.00003
Media Exposure Score (spread)	182.000	-5.074	.00003
Ranked Score	238.000	-4.905	.00003
Conservatism Score (spread)	549.000	-0.755	. 2206
Anti-Intellectualism Score			
(spread)	572.500	-0.470	. 3156
Ranked Score	577.000	-0.428	. 3372

*Siegel, S., Non-Parametric Statistics, Table A, p. 247, and p. 120.

TABLE VI - 2

DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES BY KRUSKAL-WALLIS ONE-WAY
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH RANKS*

Variable	Sum of Ranks		Degrees of Freedom	H-Statistic	Significance
	Heights	Flats			
Social Class Score (points ranked)	1788.50	696.50	1	47.030	.001
Media Exposure Score (points ranked)	1682.50	802.50	1	31.263	.001
Media Quality Score (points ranked)	1570.50	914.50	1	18.267	.001
Anti- Intellectualism Score (points ranked)	1637.00	848.00	1	25.742	.001
Conservatism Score (points unranked)	1144.00	1341.00	1	0.570	. 40

*Siegel, S., Non-Parametric Statistics, Table C, p. 249.

and may be nominal in essence. Significance of the Conservatism Score was .2206, with a z-score equivalent of -0.755. Significance of the Anti-Intellectualism Score was .3156, with a z-score equivalent of -0.470.⁵ In other words, cases from both samples are so scattered through the total ranking of scores, that it cannot be said that they are independent. This provides further justification for the removal from further consideration in the data analysis of both scores which did not work: Anti-Intellectualism and Conservatism.

The samples are independent in terms of the social-economic and cultural scores. All are significant for the two area samples, to such an extent that their probability of occurring in the same population is from near minus seven to minus five. The table shows that the Social Class Score best distinguishes the samples as independent, which corroborates the socio-economic criteria used in choosing Heights and Flats from the 1961 Census.

The ordinal scores had been submitted in complete, unranked point form for the Mann-Whitney U test. However, the ranked categories of the scores, the assignments of Low to High, could be tested also. As a further test of the independence of samples, and to test the rankings of scores, the Kruskal Wallis one-way analysis of variance by ranks was utilized. Table V - 2 shows that Social Class, Media Exposure, and ranked points for Media Quality, were all significant. Again the data were ranked for the two groups, Flats and Heights, and the null statistic, H , was determined from the sums of ranks. If the samples were from the same populations, then H is distributed as chi-square at an insignificant level,⁶ in Conservatism's case, at .40. However, the other scales are all significant at the .001 level with the Kruskal-Wallis test. Ties are

corrected for in this test, which is particularly important in the cases of scores which do not have a vast point-range. Siegel comments that the "Kruskal-Wallis test seems to be the most efficient of the non-parametric tests for k independent samples. It has power-efficiency of. . 95.5 per cent, when compared with the F test, the most powerful parametric test".⁷

If the sample of Academics had been randomly chosen, and if it were larger than seventeen respondents, the third group would have been included in these tests of independence of sample. However, non-randomness violates the assumptions of both Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis tests.

Let us turn then, to the comparison of the image-makers with their images of the intellectual. Tables will be presented and discussed, with chi-square values and percentages shown.

Research Question One

The key research question of the project was whether or not different images of the intellectual characterize persons of different social class positions. For discussion pertinent to this question, we have chosen the Social Class Score as the social class indicator, instead of the area breakdown of Flats and Heights. Two reasons contributed to this decision--most important, that the Social Class Score is known to comprise specific items which measure socio-economic position and is more valid than Area, which is only assumed to reflect socio-economic position. That is, although the statistics just discussed have shown that the area samples are independent for social class, the only sure item involved in Area as a measure of social class is that purchasing power was inversely required in obtaining residence in the Flats and Heights.

The second reason for using the Social Class Score involves status inconsistency. Among the respondents in the Flats were wives of two high status households, one husband being manager of a factory and in the highest income category, and the other husband being a lecturer at the University. In the Heights, one of the families sampled earned less than \$6,000. a year, and two males were in blue-collar occupations in industry. Clearly, the assumption that high socio-economic status is closely associated with area of residence is not violated by a few exceptions. However, the Social Class Score is the means by which status groupings are consistent, and distortion of data because of inconsistent cases is minimized using that measure.⁸

Social Class and Characteristics of Intellectuals

Table VI - 3 shows that the association between Social Class and the initial question on Characteristics of 'the intellectual' is significant at the .01 level. The categories of 'wide knowledge', 'intelligence', 'scholarly interests', 'status' were discussed in the previous chapter. Of the 28 Low Class respondents, 13 (46%) say they do not know what an intellectual is, and six of the remainder stress the 'intelligence', 'braininess' or 'smart' qualities of men of ideas. It will be recalled that the argument was made in Chapter V, that the root word intelligence may be the simplest referent for respondents who have no familiarity with the intellectual label. The table reveals that the Low and Middle Class respondents are the only ones who stressed such characteristics, with 40% respectively in those class groups.

Considering the High Social Class category, 11 (42% of all High Class subjects) replied that 'wide knowledge' in the sense of high education and expertise, characterize intellectuals, making up 61% of

TABLE VI - 3

CHARACTERISTICS OF INTELLECTUAL BY SOCIAL CLASS SCORE

Social Class Score	Wide Knowledge		Intelli- gence		Scholarly Interests		Status		Don't know		Totals	
	(%)		(%)		(%)*		(%)		(%)		(%)	
Low	4	(22)	6	(40)	2	(17)	3	(60)	13	(65)	28	(40)
Middle	3	(17)	6	(40)	2	(17)	0	(0)	5	(25)	16	(23)
High	11	(61)	3	(20)	8	(67)	2	(40)	2	(10)	26	(37)
Totals	18		15		12		5		20		70	

$$\chi^2 = 20.564 \quad (df=8) \quad P \quad .01$$

* Percentages have been rounded, and may not equal 100%.

TABLE VI - 4

CHARACTERISTICS OF INTELLECTUALS BY YEARS OF EDUCATION OF RESPONDENT

Respondent's Years of Education	Characteristics of Intellectuals											
	Wide Knowledge		Intelli- gence		Scholarly Interests		Status		Don't Know		Totals	
	(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)	
Under 9 yrs.	0	(0)	3	(20)	0	(0)	1	(20)	10	(50)	14	(20)
9-12 years	11	(61)	8	(53)	4	(33)	4	(80)	6	(30)	33	(47)
13 years & over	7	(39)	4	(27)	8	(67)	0	(0)	4	(20)	23	(33)
Totals	18		15		12		5		20		70	

$$\chi^2 = 25.942 \quad (df=8) \quad .01 \quad P \quad .001$$

those answers. Another eight (31%) say that 'scholarly interests' and the pursuit of such values connote 'the intellectual' to them--67% of that category. We have pointed out in the discussion of the themes in these answers, that the self-image of the so-called intellectuals who write historically about the man of ideas, seems to be closest to the 'scholarly interests' category. Therefore, considering that 67% of these replies were made by the High Class respondents, and a similar proportion of the Low Class group (65%) did not know what the intellectual-label meant, class differences exist most interestingly. The High status respondents have considerably more familiarity with the intellectual's class self-definition than the Low status respondents, whose replies are much more vague.

Recalling that eleven of the seventeen (65%) Academic-intellectuals interviewed had stressed 'scholarly interests' and 'playing with ideas', we might say that these eight High status respondents have utilized the "in-group" categorization. This is not to say that the entire High Social Class group of respondents are in tune with the intellectual's self-image--far from it, when they represent only 31% of the group. Nor are the eight the only ones who replied in this way, the other four are spread in the lower class categories, indicating that the social type is not unknown to the low socio-economic strata.

Is the research question answered more clearly by considering the association between respondent's education level and their perception of intellectual characteristics? Table VI - 4 shows that when the sample is classified in terms of education level, there are sharper differences between categories of response. None of the twelve who answered 'scholarly interests' have less than nine years of education, and indeed eight of

them had university-level educations. 'Wide knowledge' is the modal response for the high-school educated, and 'Don't know' was used by ten (50%) of the public-school educated respondents. The higher the education, then, the more likelihood that the respondent uses the "in-group" self-image of 'scholarly interests' as the defining characteristic of the intellectual. The lower the education, the more likelihood that the label 'an intellectual' will not be familiar to a respondent, and he will not know the description of this "out-group" social type.

Support for the different images held by people of widely different socio-economic positions can be given by examining the question which followed the initial label's introduction. Respondents were asked "If someone said to you, John Doe is a typical intellectual, what would he be like--in personality, and physically." We shall consider the personality description, compared with Social Class in Table VI - 5 and significant at .05 level. The Ichabod Crane stereotype discussed in Chapter V will be recalled, it underlies the 'introversion' category--serious, studious, always reading books. The tweedy, pipe-smoking authority underlies the 'extroversion and status' category--someone who would give reliable advice, a leader of the community, nice to everybody. The 'high education' category included respondents who said the typical intellectual is knowledgeable, a well-educated person who'd use a lot of big words. so his intellectualism would stand out.

Table VI - 5 reveals that the Low Social Class image of the typical intellectual is somewhat varied--either they do not know what he'd be like, or they dichotomize between the highly educated person and the extroverted authority. (It is relevant to note that the seven who stressed Status included five Low Class respondents, for whom the intel-

TABLE VI - 5

TRAITS OF TYPICAL INTELLECTUAL BY SOCIAL CLASS SCORE

Social Class Score	Traits of Typical Intellectual								Totals	
	High Education		Introversion		Extroversion & Status*		Don't Know			
	(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)		(&)	
Low	7	(50)	4	(15)	9	(53)	8	(67)	28	(40)
Middle	3	(21)	8	(29)	3	(18)	2	(17)	16	(23)
High	4	(29)	15	(56)	5	(29)	2	(17)	26	(37)
Totals	14		27		17		12		70	

$$\chi^2 = 15.441 \quad (df=8) \quad P \quad .05$$

* 7 of the responses stressed Status.

lectual is simply another elite type.) The extrovert-status category included 53% of the Low Class subjects, and similarly, their contribution was 50% to the highly educated category. Conceptually, the two categories are similar enough that we may not argue that the Low Class have disparate views of the typical intellectual--these respondents may simply be describing different facets of the same personality type.

There is much more consensus among the High Class respondents. Fifteen of the 26 (58%) of their replies were classed under Introversion, making up 56% of the responses in that category. Following their stress on wide education and scholarly interests, the High Class group consider the typical intellectual to be serious and a book-worm. 'Introversion' includes eight (50%) of the Middle Class. Their image is of the 'scholar', the intellectual as withdrawn into a world of ideas and abstractions, not of him as an expert-advisor whose ideas are on public display. We shall see the implications of these differing points of view when examining the responses to questions on employment and goals of intellectuals. Although Introversion appears to claim the plurality of responses, 27 of 70, if the other two categories were combined they would include 31 of the respondents.

Before leaving the 'typical intellectual', let us consider a different version of the question which was given to the Academic control group. The seventeen professors were asked "If a manual worker said to you, 'John Doe is a typical intellectual', what would you think John Doe would be like to him?" The replies could be directly transferred into the categories mentioned by Flats and Heights respondents, but group naturally as:

Bookish, impractical, isolated from 'life'	13
High status snob, 'know-it-all'	8
Other: feelings, ambivalent to negative	8

Since we classified all replies, more than seventeen responses are totalled. The tendencies are evident, however--the Academics anticipate the manual worker's image will be a negative stereotype of either the book-worm or the know-it-all. They have dramatized the polite replies which the other respondents did in fact produce, and perhaps have perceived the attitudinal aspects of the cognitive replies we categorized. What the Academics underestimated was the extent to which the typical intellectual would be a helpful advisor in the perception of the lower socio-economic group. Even though they stress that ambivalence, an equal mixture of admiration and suspicion, exists in the stereotypes of intellectuals, the Academics seem to express the super-sensitivity of a minority group's self-image.⁹ While some of them may have had personal confrontations with anti-intellectual people, the generalized expression of a negative view reveals some of the Academics' own stereotypes about "Others". Hofstadter, Gurko and Curti have all remarked the implications of drawing boundaries between intellectuals and other people.¹⁰

"Special" Characteristics

As was discussed in Chapter V, a question was included to investigate the perception of the "specialness" of intellectuals, to see whether or not the image connoted that intellectuals were separate from normal people. Is this one of the characteristics defining the man of ideas? Table VI - 6 shows the insignificance of a tabulation of perceived "specialness" by Area of residence, which itself is used as slightly more indicative of differences than the tabulation by Social Class Score.¹¹ Only sixteen respondents viewed the intellectual as the same sort of

TABLE VI - 6

"SPECIALNESS" OF INTELLECTUAL BY AREA OF RESIDENCE

Area of Residence	Are Intellectuals "Special"?										Totals	
	No, Same		Yes, Better		Yes, Nuttier		Yes, Try Harder		Don't Know			
	(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)	
Flats	9	(56)	15	(45)	3	(43)	5	(56)	4	(80)	36	(51)
Heights	7	(44)	18	(55)	4	(57)	4	(44)	1	(20)	34	(49)
Totals	16		33		7		9		5		70	
$\chi^2 = 2.522$ (df=4) P .60												

TABLE VI - 7

"SPECIALNESS" OF INTELLECTUAL BY YEARS OF EDUCATION OF RESPONDENT

Years of Education of Respondent	Are Intellectuals "Special"?										Totals	
	No, Same		Yes, Better		Yes, Nuttier		Yes, Try Harder		Don't Know			
	(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)	
Under 9 yrs.	0	(0)	10	(30)	1	(14)	2	(22)	1	(20)	14	(20)
9-12 years	11	(69)	9	(27)	4	(57)	5	(56)	4	(80)	33	(47)
13 years & over	5	(31)	14	(42)	2	(29)	2	(22)	0	(0)	23	(33)
Totals	16		33		7		9		5		70	
$\chi^2 = 13.789$ (df=8) P .10												

person as the non-intellectual, 23% of the total; whereas 33 perceive intellectuals as 'better' than normal people, seven see them as 'nuttier', and nine think they just 'try harder'. The usual residual 'don't know' group is evident, now reduced to five respondents. Differences are so slight that few comments are worthwhile, except to note that Flats subjects have a slight majority in the perception of the intellectual as no different from others, while a few more Heights residents are willing to call intellectuals 'better' than other people. The consensus is that they are different, but in several slightly different ways which would have been better measured with a probative question. Only seven respondents said they think the intellectuals are 'nuttier', oddballs and strange in essence.

Table VI - 7 examines this question in terms of respondent's years of education--and near significance is evident with a chi-square at the .10 level of significance. Of the 'same' replies, eleven (69%) are seen to be high-school-educated, and none of the public-school educated reply in the no-difference category. Most of the public-school-educated respondents perceive the intellectual as better than the ordinary. Additionally, fourteen of the highly educated respondents call intellectuals 'better'--42% of those replies. Whether they intend to show a respectful awe as might be attributed to the lowest-educated view, or whether a touch of snobbery is implied, cannot be known from the existent data. It is also notable that five of the highly educated see the intellectual as the 'same' as other people, raising the question of whether they are respondents familiar enough with intellectual-types that they are not awed, or whether they dislike drawing ordinary-special lines about people.

In summary, there is a varied pattern of differences between the conceptions of intellectuals held by persons of low socio-economic status and of high status. Their initial reactions to the label were different in the quantity and quality of imagery. For most of the Low Class, vague puzzlement existed initially; for the High Class group, a split between categories describing wide knowledge and expertise, or scholarly interests resulted. On examination of their views of the typical intellectual, we have seen that the lower status respondents see "John Doe" as a well-educated authority and community leader, while high status respondents view him as the introverted scholar or book-worm. Academic-intellectuals are dubious of tolerance by manual workers, and anticipate very negative views of their typical type. The majority of respondents of both class extremes consider that intellectuals are "special" in a 'better' than ordinary sense, and those who consider men of ideas as the same as other people are usually at least high-school-educated.

Research Question Two

The second research question asked: "What social positions intellectuals are perceived to occupy, what status, occupations, perceptions of power and affiliations." We shall discuss the two questions which probed their occupational roles, and make inferences about the institutions with which they are assumed to affiliate. A question on the schooling felt necessary for intellectualism will also be analyzed in this section.

Chapter III briefly outlined the problems which evolved from asking the two questions about intellectual occupations in reverse order. First, respondents were given a list of careers from which to choose those which seemed to have mostly intellectuals in them, and somewhat later in the interview, the open-ended question on fields of employment

was asked.¹² We shall consider the latter first, to understand the perceptions of general spheres of employment.

Social Class and Perceived Intellectual Employment

Table VI - 8 presents data in regard to the relationship between respondents' perceived employment of intellectuals and their Social Class Scores. The 'academic' category is used for those who consider intellectuals to be mostly university or secondary school professors and teachers. Sometimes the response was general enough to imply research work at the university as well, but the job most-mentioned was 'professor'. Clearly, the institutional affiliation is education, and specifically the centers of higher learning; and the 'academic' category was emphasized by fifteen of the seventy respondents, 21%. As the table shows, 47% of the academic-perceptions were made by respondents of High Social Class scores. The inference must be that with their high educations and professional-managerial occupations, the High Class are more familiar with 'the intellectual as academic'. However, more than one-quarter of the responses were made by persons Low in Social Class. Most often they had either named 'teaching' as the field, or specified 'at the university'. The localization which was evident by the latter, and others saying 'at U. of A.', shows both that the University is highly visible in Edmonton to all levels of citizens, and that Low Class respondents tend to particularize. It is not the general academic field which some perceive, but a specific attachment to the local University.

More frequently than the academic, however, the fields of employment mentioned were classifiable as 'professional'. The list of careers which had been considered earlier may have influenced this concentration, since a high number of professions was listed. The standard

TABLE VI - 8

PERCEIVED EMPLOYMENT OF INTELLECTUALS BY SOCIAL CLASS SCORE

Social Class Score	Perceived Employment of Intellectuals												Totals				
	Academic				Cultural				Profes- sional		Elite			Varies		Don't Know	
	(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)			(%)			
Low	4	(26)	1	(14)	5	(28)	5	(100)	4	(36)	9	(64)	28	(40)			
Middle	4	(26)	1	(14)	7	(39)	0	(0)	2	(18)	2	(14)	16	(23)			
High	7	(47)	5	(71)	6	(33)	0	(0)	5	(46)	3	(22)	26	(37)			
Totals	15		7		18		5		11		14		70				
$\chi^2 = 18.534$																	
(df=10) P .05																	

TABLE VI - 9

CUMULATIVE CHOICES FROM LIST OF CAREERS OF
INTELLECTUAL BY SOCIAL CLASS SCORE

Ranked Social Class	Choices from List of Careers										Totals	
	(1)*		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)			
	(<i>%</i>)		(<i>%</i>)		(<i>%</i>)		(<i>%</i>)		(<i>%</i>)		(<i>%</i>)	
Low	2	(20)	12	(67)	4	(20)	9	(60)	1	(14)	28	(40)
Middle	3	(30)	4	(22)	2	(10)	2	(13)	5	(71)	16	(23)
High	5	(50)	2	(11)	14	(70)	4	(27)	1	(14)	26	(37)
Totals	10		18		20		15		7		70	
$\chi^2 = 29.320$ (df=8) P .001												

* Key: (1) Chose only some of: Scientist, Professor, Philosopher
(2) Some above plus some of: Doctor, Social Worker, Schoolteacher
(3) Some above plus some of: Writer, Editor, Artist
(4) Some above plus some of: Politician, Banker, Industrialist
(5) Some above plus some of: Salesman, Electrical Engineer

'helping professions' of physician, dentist, lawyer, minister, even accountant, were mentioned by eighteen of the seventy respondents (26% of the total). Thirty-nine per cent of these were Middle Class subjects, of white collar or semi-professional jobs. The 'typical' intellectual is perceived as one who is an expert, specialized in training and working in a highly skilled job. This conception appears to fit 44% of the Middle Class respondents, who may be slightly lower than that highly expert level in their own jobs.

Considering the Low Class respondents in Table VI - 8, fully nine of them (32%) say that they don't know what fields of employment attract 'intellectuals', or refer back to the list as having covered all alternatives. The only answers which generally or specifically place intellectuals in 'elite' occupations are five made by Low Class respondents. The responses included 'like the mayor' and 'leading the country'. In a sense, political elitism is meant more than economic elitism such as 'top dogs'. The Low Class are quick to conceive of intellectuals as professionals, mentioning doctors, social workers, and other helping-professions.

The majority, 71%, who view the intellectual as working in 'cultural' occupations in the arts, literature and so on, are High in Social Class Scores. The previous chapter has discussed the declining image of the intellectual as artist, writer or critic, as professor and scientist types become widely recognized as 'the intellectual' today.¹³ However, the classic inclusion of the arts as centers of intellectualism has not been forgotten by the High Social Class. It may be due to a greater awareness of long-lasting images of intellectuals, or it may be due to the involvement of high status people in levels of culture and the arts where so-called intellectuals are common. What is interesting,

however, is that only 10% of the respondents thought of the intellectual as working in cultural-artistic fields, and of these only one person was of Low Social Class status.

Of those eleven respondents who insisted that the intellectuals' fields of employment were as varied as the ranges of jobs, almost the same number were of Low and High Social Class. More respondents were willing to admit the variety of intellectual occupations than wanted to categorize men of ideas in cultural fields. It may have been pride that intellect itself cuts across class boundaries for respondents of various statuses to say 'a ditch-digger could be an intellectual', or 'intellectuals could be employed anywhere, that's immaterial'. These answers pointed out that the perceived basis of intellectualism is irrelevant to daily tasks in a job, that men of ideas could be like moon-lighters, pursuing ideas after work-hours.

Having sketched the general fields of response to the question of intellectual employment, we shall turn to the question which respondents faced earlier, on choices of intellectual careers from a list of jobs. It is evident from Table VI - 9 that choices were very different and significant with Social Class at the .001 level. The problems of analyzing a set of chosen occupations from a list of fourteen were finally resolved by cumulating the choices. A respondent was classed in group one if he listed only some or all of 'scientist', 'professor', 'philosopher'. Similarly, someone who included careers from categories one, two or more, but also included 'electrical engineer' was categorized in group five. The careers were listed in order of choice, with scientist and professor being mentioned most often, and salesman and electrical engineer most rarely.

For the High Social Class group of respondents, the table shows that the academic careers, the listed 'helping-professions', and the careers representing the arts, were most inclusive of their views. Twenty-one of the 26 High status respondents restricted their occupational category for intellectuals to these first three classes. The table also reveals that the Low Social Class respondents were spread further. Nearly half of them considered that intellectuals work at some of the academic jobs listed, or are among the professionals listed in the second group. But another nine (32%) included some of 'politician', 'banker' and 'industrialist' careers as being filled with intellectuals. Again, there is an assumption on the part of some low-status citizens that 'the intellectual' is just another member of the elite, and he earns his living high in economic or political leadership positions. Of these fourth-group jobs, it was the politician which was most-mentioned.¹⁴ Over one-quarter of those including this category were High status respondents, some of whom would have firsthand familiarity with persons in such elite positions.

Of additional interest are the two outside columns of the table, the ten perceptions of exclusively academic-research careers as pertinent to intellectuals, and the seven who include 'salesmen' and 'electrical engineers'. The last-named job was included in the list as a highly specialized field, to see whether respondents would think in such specific terms--clearly they did not, since 'electrical engineer' was least chosen of the fourteen listed careers. White collar, Middle status respondents viewed 'salesman' as a job in which a high proportion are intellectuals--again revealing pride in their in-group's perceived intellectualism. The most exclusive perceivers are the ten who view only three listed careers

as appropriate--and half of these are High status respondents. The High Social Class group of respondents as a whole were proportionately more 'exclusive' in the jobs they consider intellectual than were the Low or Middle Class respondents. Yet, the 19% of the High Class who named 'scientist', 'professor' and 'philosopher' were showing familiarity with the classical view of intellectuals' employed roles as philosophers or poets,¹⁵ and with the current trend toward perceived affiliation with academic and research institutions.

The modern image of the intellectual's occupational role may have been shown to be the 'scientist' or the 'professor'. In the current empirical literature which at all relates to the social type, it seemed that studies of the scientist and professor were the only ones reported. In other words, it should not surprise us that the most-chosen careers were 'scientist' and 'professor'. Since the list was alphabetic, it cannot be argued that these were the most obvious careers from which to choose. We can conclude from the general response to the careers question, that the occupational prototype of the intellectual is that of the professor, whether he works in the sciences or in philosophy.

Respondent Occupations and Perceived Intellectual Jobs

Clarification of the perceptions of employment of intellectuals is possible by regarding these from the respondents' own occupational perspective. Do respondents view the so-called intellectual as working in their own occupational strata? Or is there an inverse relationship, are intellectuals thought to be so different from them that respondents view intellectuals in different socio-economic strata?

Table VI - 10 shows perceived employment of intellectuals in terms of the occupations of male household-heads. The respondents of

TABLE VI - 10

PERCEIVED EMPLOYMENT OF INTELLECTUALS BY
OCCUPATIONS OF WORKING MALES

Working Male Occupations	Perceived Employment												Totals*
	Academic		Cultural		Professional		Elite		Varies		Don't Know		
	(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)
Professional Managerial	9	(69)	5	(71)	6	(35)	0	(0)	5	(56)	2	(15)	27 (42)
White Collar	2	(15)	0	(0)	5	(29)	0	(0)	1	(11)	3	(23)	11 (17)
Skilled Blue Collar	1	(8)	2	(29)	3	(18)	2	(40)	2	(22)	4	(30)	14 (22)
Unskilled Blue Collar	1	(8)	0	(0)	3	(18)	3	(60)	1	(11)	4	(30)	12 (19)
Totals	13		7		17		5		9		13		64

$$\chi^2 = 23.279 \quad (df=15) \quad .10 \quad P \quad .05$$

*Omits 6, 2 households without males, and 4 retired men.

of unskilled blue-collar workers concentrate their replies in the 'elite' category for intellectuals, with 60% of the 'elite' perceptions by these subjects, who make up one-quarter of the unskilled group. The largest number of these respondents, four of the twelve, do not know where intellectuals might work. Thus, at the lowest occupational level, employments of so-called intellectuals are not known, hence are presumed to be opposite, at the highest 'elite' level of the social scale.

At the other extreme, one-third of the households with professional or managerial male heads consider intellectuals to be found in 'academic' jobs. They constitute 69% of the respondents who named academic fields. An additional six, 22% of professional respondents, view intellectuals as working in their own 'professional' fields. And the highest concentration of white-collar replies, 46%, are also in the 'professional' job-category for intellectuals. Thus, for these respondents, the intellectual is somewhat felt to be one of their own, and they conceive of him as an occupational peer. Professional-managerial respondents account for twenty of the thirty-seven responses to 'academic', 'cultural' and 'professional' categories, implying that they categorize intellectuals in work-roles familiar to them, either from their own work-circle, or their leisure world.

Fully 71% of those respondents who include intellectuals in 'cultural' occupations are from the professional-managerial field. Possibly they are more active patrons of the arts than the lower socio-economic and occupational levels, and are more ready to conceive of cultural performers as intellectual. Professional-managerial households can afford to be more familiar with cultural fields than can unskilled blue-collar workers.

The comments just made are strengthened somewhat by scrutiny of Table VI - 11, where the chi-square is significant at .001 between male occupations and cumulative choices of intellectual careers from the list. While none of the unskilled blue-collar respondents considered men of ideas to be only scientists, professors, or philosophers, 75% of them (nine of twelve) thought that some of these and such professions as 'doctor', 'teacher' and 'social worker' constitute most intellectual employments.

Most of the professional-managerial respondents did not consider the three listed professions to be sufficient, but either mentioned the core academic list, or went on to include 'writers', 'editors' and 'artists' as important intellectual occupations. It was the skilled blue-collar households which specified 'politicians', 'bankers' and 'industrialists' to be occupations full of intellectuals. We have already pointed out that the lower occupational groups have an elitist view of intellectual work.

Respondent Education and Intellectual Training

We turn now to a question of the schooling necessary for intellectualism. Respondents were asked how much formal schooling they felt was necessary for intellectualism. A relevant comparison was made with the respondent's own educational level, and Table VI - 12 shows a significant relationship, between .05 and .02, existed.

Most of the poorly educated--to the end of elementary school or Grade Eight--replied either vaguely that 'a lot' or 'as much as they can get' would be important or else they felt 'at least high school' would be important. At times they generalized to the impossibility of anyone 'getting anywhere' without a high school education.

TABLE VI - 11

CUMULATIVE CHOICES FROM LIST OF CAREERS OF INTELLECTUALS BY
OCCUPATION OF WORKING MALES

Working Male Occupations	Choices from list of Careers					Totals**
	(1)*	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Professional Managerial	6 (60)	1 (7)	15 (79)	3 (23)	1 (17)	26 (41)
White Collar	1 (10)	3 (20)	2 (11)	3 (23)	2 (33)	11 (17)
Skilled Blue Collar	3 (30)	2 (13)	2 (11)	5 (38)	2 (33)	14 (22)
Unskilled Blue Collar	0 (0)	9 (60)	0 (0)	2 (15)	1 (17)	12 (19)
Totals	10	15	19	13	6	63

$$\chi^2 = 38.350 \quad (df=12) \quad P \quad .001$$

* Key: same as for Table VI-9

** Omits 7, 2 households without males, 4 retired, 1 no answer.

TABLE VI - 12

SCHOOLING NEEDED FOR INTELLECTUALISM BY
YEARS OF EDUCATION OF RESPONDENT

Respondent Years of Education	Schooling Needed for Intellectualism				Totals*
	Generally, "lots"	University	High School	Not Important	
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Under 9 yrs	7 (41)	2 (8)	3 (37)	1 (6)	13 (20)
9-12 years	5 (29)	14 (56)	5 (63)	7 (47)	31 (48)
13 years & over	5 (29)	9 (36)	0 (0)	7 (47)	21 (32)
Totals	17	25	8	15	65

$$\chi^2 = 13.786 \quad (df=6) \quad .05 \quad P \quad .02$$

* Less 5 who did not know how to answer.

The largest number of respondents who stressed 'university' amounts of schooling were fourteen with high school background, indicating that they perceived that more than their own background was necessary for intellectualism. One-sixth of the high-school-educated subjects felt that high school was sufficient, that their own backgrounds could produce intellectuals.

The table also reveals another group who perceived intellectualism to require the levels of education they themselves had obtained. The largest number of university and technically educated respondents, 43%, viewed university amounts of schooling to be necessary. One-third, however, of this well-educated group, suggested that formal schooling was not necessarily important to intellectualism. Over 20% of the high-school-educated respondents also felt that the amount of schooling was immaterial. These fifteen people were making the point that the essential for intellectualism was another kind of learning which could be acquired without extensive formal schooling. Some in fact commented that even a self-educated person could be an intellectual as long as he kept up the pursuit of knowledge.

Two different views of the question of 'schooling' are evident in this data. Fifty of the respondents connoted that the acquisition of knowledge involved in intellectualism was directly related to the organized learning obtained in schools and universities. Only fifteen of the respondents separated 'formal' from 'informal' educations, to argue that the hours spent in classrooms might not lead to intellectualism, but that private or self-education was essential.

Educational status in the formal atmosphere of the university was clearly associated with intellectualism, as the 25 of 65 respondents

show. It may have been inferred that since intellectualism requires large amounts of education for knowledge, that anybody who has attended university might be a potential intellectual.

In summary, we have found that the perceived social position of intellectuals is quite high. Some of the lowest status respondents generally consider them to be members of the political and economic elite, in appropriate occupational fields. Respondents of low and middle social status consider intellectuals to have attained a high amount of formal education, probably university level, and to be engaged in professional or academic spheres of employment--from social workers and doctors to scientists and professors. Respondents of high social status considered intellectuals to be employed in a variety of fields: academic, professional, cultural, or perhaps manual jobs. Although it is common to associate intellectualism with university educations, a minority of higher status subjects felt that specific levels of education were not important to intellectual knowledge. But since the most-mentioned careers of intellectuals were those categories of 'professor' and 'scientist', advanced degrees were generally assumed to be part of intellectual status.

Academics and Perceived Intellectual Jobs

Did the Academic group emphasize particular occupations to feature many intellectuals? No, when asked how they would apply the label, seven specifically stated that occupation is unimportant. A majority of the seventeen infer that occupation is not the vital criterion by stressing certain 'concerns' as important.

Of those who do mention occupations, seven say that intellectuals are usually professionals, upper-middle-class people, one says they are primarily academics, another emphasizes the arts. Four others state

that intellectuals have to be educated, whether self-taught or school-trained, they are experts who have deep knowledge of one or more fields.

The 'scholarly interests' category was evident in the Academic replies of eight who stressed that anyone who is a thinker or a critic of a certain type is an intellectual. The important thing to them is his concern with "political and cultural life" as one put it, with "scientific, human and artistic matters", as another phrased it.

In addition to the caution that intellectuals could be in any occupation, one respondent mentioned that people are sometimes intellectual and sometimes not--that when one is being intellectual, one is thinking rationally, drawing logical conclusions. Clearly, in this perspective, intellectualism is not a continuous state. But social typing covers the general condition, not temporary lapses of persons categorized as particular social types. What we have found is that traits considered important for the so-called intellectual by citizens from the Flats and Heights, jobs held, are unimportant in the view of most of the Academic sample.

Research Question Three

The third research question asked what goals and values are attributed to intellectuals, what ends they are considered to be working toward. The previous chapter categorized the responses in terms of 'status' characteristics such as money and prestige, 'social change' goals such as improving their communities and solving human problems, and 'personal fulfillment' goals related to their satisfactions obtained from the pursuit of ideas. Here we shall discuss which kinds of respondents perceived each of these goals, particularly noting social class differences so as to bolster the argument that perceptions differ as 'social worlds'

of respondents differ.

Social Class and Perceived Goals

Table VI - 13 reveals a relationship significant at the .01 level between social class and the perceptions of intellectual goals. The Low Social Class group make up 83% of the 'Status' replies. Since they stressed elite employments of intellectuals, it does follow for them to emphasize money and prestige as accompanying goals of men of ideas. Status and 'getting ahead' are vital concerns for respondents whose incomes may be under \$3,000 a year, and it is not surprising that the Low class generalizes the pursuit of money to the social type under study. Chapter V has already quoted such responses as "Everybody's trying to make a living",¹⁶ which illustrates their assumption that status is the major concern of intellectuals too.

Almost as many Low Class respondents answered in terms of the goal of 'social change' as most-held by intellectuals. However, they made up only one-quarter of the respondents with that perception. More important in contribution were the six Low Class respondents who perceived intellectual goals as varied. Low status subjects are 60% of those answering that intellectuals could both pursue status and their own scholastic ideals, or that some could work toward any of the goals conceivable. Only one High Social Class respondent viewed the goals of intellectuals as varied or multiple.

The table indicates that the greatest number of High Social Class respondents view intellectuals as pursuing goals of societal improvement and 'social change'. The nine High status respondents who answer in terms of 'personal fulfillment' as the major goal of intellectuals make up 64% of the 'fulfillment' responses. They consider that men of ideas

TABLE VI - 13

PERCEIVED GOALS OF INTELLECTUALS BY SOCIAL CLASS SCORE

Ranked Social Class	Goals of Intellectuals								Totals	
	Status		Social Change		Personal Fulfilment		Varies			
	(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)	
Low	10	(83)	9	(26)	3	(22)	6	(60)	28	(40)
Middle	2	(17)	9	(28)	2	(14)	3	(30)	16	(23)
High	0	(0)	16	(47)	9	(64)	1	(10)	26	(37)
Totals	12		34		14		10		70	
$\chi^2 = 20.577$		(df=6)		P		.01				

TABLE VI - 14

PERCEIVED GOALS OF INTELLECTUALS BY YEARS OF EDUCATION OF RESPONDENT

Years of Education of Respondent	Goals of Intellectuals								Totals	
	Status		Social Change		Personal Fulfilment		Varies			
		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)
Under 9 yrs.	5	(42)	5	(15)	1	(7)	3	(30)	14	(20)
9-12 years	7	(58)	16	(47)	5	(36)	5	(50)	33	(47)
13 years & over	0	(0)	13	(38)	8	(57)	2	(20)	23	(33)
Totals	12		34		14		10		70	
$\chi^2 = 12.933$		(df=6)		P		.05				

are first of all desirous of the satisfactions which come from their individual quests after knowledge and understanding. Of the Low Class respondents who replied stressing 'personal fulfillment', their answers tended to be more vague, mentioning 'happiness' in general rather than a satisfaction gained from Doing Their Own Thing.

Clearly half of the respondents considered the intellectual to be working for the good of society, attempting to change things for the better, to apply their knowledge to important problems. The previous chapter has suggested the ideal nature of this perception--it is what respondents think that intellectuals should be doing which they have phrased.¹⁷

Sixteen of the 'social change' responses were made by High Class respondents, just under half of the answers stressing 'social change'. Such high status respondents perceived the intellectual as working for the benefit of the community in solving complex physical and social problems, which his special knowledge enables him to do. The other respondents who stressed this type of goal were evenly split between Low and Middle status, and also emphasized that intellectuals tried to improve things. Some of these replies were almost cynical, as was mentioned in Chapter V:¹⁸ "working for the good of humanity; at least that would be what they'd tell you". If social change is a societal ideal, and the man of knowledge is considered best able to produce it; still, some awareness is evident that the real may be different from the ideal. Intellectuals ought to be working for the good of the society, and many respondents, particularly of the High Social Class, gave them the benefit of the doubt, while some frankly admitted that they perceived status or multiple goals, or even personal satisfactions had superseded the ideal goal.

However, the table shows that only the Low status respondents are convinced that intellectuals pursue status goals such as money and prestige. None of the High Class respondents mentioned this as the primary goal, instead they emphasized the lesser known goal of 'personal fulfillment', the intellectual's drive to know and to understand in order to satisfy his curiosity. Even if the High Class respondents are the majority of respondents who mention 'personal fulfillment', most of them stress that intellectuals pursue 'social change'.

Education and Perceived Goals of Intellectuals

Is the pattern traced above any different when intellectual goals are tabulated with the education levels of the respondents? Table VI - 14 shows a less significant chi-square obtains between education and goals as held between respondents' social class scores and perceived goals. The most interesting columns are those of 'social change' and 'personal fulfillment', where differences are now clarified between the High social class respondents. The majority of respondents who stress 'social change' as the intellectual goal are of high-school education--47%. The majority of those emphasizing the goal of 'personal fulfillment' are respondents of university levels of education--57%. Only one public-school-educated respondent suggests that 'personal fulfillment' is the major goal of so-called intellectuals.

The large proportion of respondents with high school educations--33 of 70--reduces the spread of data through the table. Possibly if more respondents had been obtained with less than nine years of schooling, the even numbers mentioning 'status' and 'social change' would have altered. However, in Table VI - 14, the public-school-educated pattern is unclear, the high-school-educated stress 'social change', as do the highest

educated. While half the high-school-trained emphasize 'social change', and the next highest alternative for them is 'status'; for the university educated, 57% mention 'social change', and the next highest is 'personal fulfillment'.

Finally, it is also clear that of the respondents who mention a variety or a multiplicity of intellectual goals, 50% were high-school-educated. Two had university-level-educations, and ranked their perceptions of intellectual goals such as: "First, knowledge; second, humanity's future; third, self-improvement".¹⁹

Research question three has been answered in describing the high number of respondents of all status and education levels who stress 'social change' as the goal of intellectuals. It is unclear whether to some respondents this is the ideal of what men of ideas should be working for, or whether it is firmly believed that this is what most men of ideas really are attempting. Some cynicism is evident, as is some idealism, better evidenced in the quotations given in the previous chapter. The second mentioned perception of the goal of so-called intellectuals was toward 'personal fulfillment', which was variously described to mean general satisfaction and the specific happiness which intellectuals obtain from their pursuit of knowledge and understanding. The respondents who stressed this goal were high in social class and in years of education. These respondents did not mention the third goal, that of 'status', whether monetary or prestigious, which was considered by low status respondents to be important. Intellectuals were thought to be the same as other citizens, trying to secure their futures and to get ahead economically. One-seventh of the respondents felt that a mixture of a variety of goals were more appropriate in considering intellectuals,

for whom status might be a by-product, after major concern with adding to knowledge for their own joy and the social good.

Academics and Perceived Goals

Two special questions were included in the Academic interviews which tapped the goals of intellectuals of this type. They were asked why they were in the academic world, and what their own occupational goals were. We shall deal with these in sequence.

To the question on why they were academics, five of the professors replied that they "like it", explaining that there is a unique combination of teaching and research jobs in university positions which particularly suit their tastes. Yet an additional three stressed that their pleasures were from teaching, that the university level of teaching was the most satisfying part of academic life. Five more emphasized the freedom to undertake research in their own field, and to contribute to new knowledge by such research. Three professors answered that the university was the place from which one could "influence the course of events" and improve society--directly stating that their goal is 'social change'. And two of the academics combined several of the above reasons, mentioning that there were both service aspects and status aspects to academic life. From these responses, we might conclude that the five who 'like it' and the five who stress research are examples of the 'personal fulfillment' goal-seeking described by Flats and Heights samples. Six more, those who enjoy teaching, since we assume it is the imparting of knowledge which they like, and those who want to improve society exemplify the 'social change' goal-seekers. Two others express varied reasons and goals.

Evidently, from our selection of seventeen Academic intellectuals the majority describe goals which our respondents would see as yielding

personal fulfillment, and to a lesser extent, they answer in terms of societal goals. These results are clearer when the personal occupational goals of the professors are presented.

Seven of the Academics emphasized that they wished to pursue their work in their discipline, that the university was the only place where this was possible. Three others said that they wanted to be 'good' teachers, well-regarded professionally. (Four more stressed a combination of doing research, teaching, and keeping up with their own learning.) Three again stated that they wanted to improve their society, to influence it for the better. Only two of the professors described their goal in terms of administrative appointments within the university organization. What is interesting in the replies is differing emphases on teaching and research--in fact to one of the professors, his contribution to the field is worth more than rapport with students--he defines himself as more oriented to research than to teaching. With others the opposite is true, they wish to train students and disseminate knowledge.

From the standpoint of the answers the Academics gave regarding their own occupational goals, it would seem that the 'personal fulfillment' goals and the 'social change' goals are very closely entwined. Social influence may not be directly mentioned by many, but the research-additions to knowledge, and the teaching-additions to student knowledge give them personal pleasure, and have a societal effect. Though visible social change may not result, it will be the long-term effect.

Research Question Four

The fourth research question asked what might be the influence of respondents' exposure to various quantities and quality-levels of the

mass media. In addition to the substantive implication of this question, as to whether the different quality-levels of the media would expose consumers to rather different conceptions of the so-called intellectual, we were interested in these as variables. Could the amount of media exposure or the qualitative level of exposure influence directionality of response?

In order to test this question, tabulations were made simultaneously with social class, one of the media variables, and one of the dependent variables tapping the image of the intellectual. If social class seemed to be more significant, the argument for the consistency in imagery and social typing for each social world would be strengthened. If media quality seemed more significant, then a status-inconsistent cultural participation would be evidenced. The causal implications of these tabulations would be more rich if data had been collected on respondents' reference groups--their status homogeneity and cultural involvements. Further comments about these potential sources will be made in the concluding chapter.

Before turning to tables which show the effects of class and media items on intellectual indicators, it should be pointed out that the small number of respondents, seventy, made it necessary to dichotomize the variables for this phase of analysis. Social Class Scores were no longer tallied Low, Middle and High, but were cut at the modal score, ten, so that respondents with scores four to ten were 'Low' and those with from eleven to sixteen points became 'High'. Similarly, the Media Exposure scores were dichotomized at the modal score, so that the subjects with exposure scores between three and ten were to be 'Low', and those with eleven to twenty-two points were 'High'. Media Quality

median scores were similarly tallied, so that respondents from 1.0 to 2.0 scores became 'Low', and those with 2.1 to 3.3 quality medians were 'High'.

When each of the intellectual variables was to be considered, it too had to be dichotomized in the most relevant way to show two things. Items where the knowledge-factor of a cognitive image of generality or specificity was the criterion, were cut so that 'vague' and 'specific' responses would be differentiated.²⁰ Where the attitude-factor was more important, and a certain evaluation was made of the so-called intellectual, the variable was cut to dichotomize these feelings.²¹ For example, the item which asked whether subjects would restrict particular types of teachers from teaching, was cut to show those who would and those who would not be restrictive. Similarly, perceived goals of intellectuals were cut to reflect 'societal' and 'personal' emphases of respondents.

Because totals varied greatly, percentages were computed as the most standard method of reporting results. We had, for example, different numbers when dealing with media quality and media exposure. There were 37 Low Quality cases, of whom 28 were Low Social Class and five were High Social Class. The remaining 37 High Quality cases included nine Low and 28 High Social Class respondents. The matrix looked somewhat different for the examination of Media Exposure--38 were low in Exposure, of whom 27 were Low Social Class and eleven were High Social Class. Of the 32 with High Exposure, six were Low in Social Class and 26 were High. While it should be cautioned that five and six cases in total do not yield clear trends, the percentage-approach proportions unequal data for comparability.

Despite the lop-sided numbers, which make percentages necessary,

the results of this section of the analysis are clear. In most of the variables which might be considered cognitive, rather than attitudinal--in other words, those which tap descriptive images of the so-called intellectual--social class is more important than media measures. It was found that Media Exposure tabulations were much less indicative of differences between respondent-types than were Media Quality tabulations. That is, the cell percentages of tables are almost the same for low or high social class, or for whichever intellectual variable we consider in percentages. But, when tabulating the results with Media Quality, Social Class and descriptive variables such as perceived Introversion of intellectuals, vagueness or specificity of the label intellectual, or of their occupations, even whether their goals are Societal or Personal, we find Social Class determines response much more than Media Quality.

Cognitive Variables and Importance of Class Over Media

Two tables are included to show that the differences between Media Exposure results, and Media Quality are small, and that Media Exposure tables do not show anything new. One clear indicator that Social Class is significant is Table VI - 15 showing the percentage of 'specific' responses to the initial characteristics of the intellectual, by Media Exposure and Social Class scores.²² A much higher percentage of High social class respondents, irregardless of quantity of exposure, answered specifically. But, the picture is less clear when considering Media Quality, in Table VI - 16 Low and High Social Class respondents are split very differently, with the highest number of specific responses from Low Class-High Quality subjects. But quality of exposure is insignificant for High Class respondents in this question. Is it possible that the Low Social Class respondents who are exposed to High

TABLE VI - 15

SOCIAL CLASS, MEDIA EXPOSURE AND PERCENT
SPECIFIC CHARACTERISTICS

Media Exposure	Social Class			
	Low		High	
Low	19%	(5/27)	55%	(6/11)
High	33%	(2/6)	65%	(17/26)

TABLE VI - 16

SOCIAL CLASS, MEDIA QUALITY AND PERCENT
SPECIFIC CHARACTERISTICS

Media Quality	Social Class			
	Low		High	
Low	14%	(4/28)	78%	(7/9)
High	60%	(3/5)	57%	(16/28)

Media Quality are the status-aspirant sorts, who have a great deal at stake in their thorough grasp of high culture--it may be their entry to a better social world. On the other hand, these may be the European-educated respondents of Low Status, whose familiarity with the "intelligentsia" may lead them to more fluent responses than the majority of our respondents. As we shall see, the Low Status respondents of High Quality of Media participation, were the lowest percentage contributors to the tables we will consider. However, their numbers are few, and generalizations cannot be made with nine cases.

Social Class also makes a significant difference in the responses to the question on which intellectuals respondents respect. Considering the percentage of subjects who stressed "all 'true' intellectuals", we find Table VI - 17 shows that high social class responses clearly predominate, despite the quality of media exposure. The higher a respondent's social class score, the more likely he claimed to respect all intellectuals, as far as he would define people as intellectuals. Everyone worthy of the label is worthy of respect to over half of each High Status group. But only one-fifth of the Low Status groups answered this way, defining their great respect for such other categories as the activist-intellectual, or the moral leader. Not shown in this table is the finding that 60% of the Low Status, High Quality subjects say that they don't know which types of intellectuals they respect, totalling more than the 39% of the Low Status, Low Quality people who don't know how to reply.

One reason for the high number of High Status responses of respect for the 'true' intellectual may be that these people know more supposedly intellectual people. Respondents who did not know how to answer this question often stressed that they didn't know any intellec-

TABLE VI - 17

SOCIAL CLASS, MEDIA QUALITY AND PERCENT
ALL "TRUE" INTELLECTUALS RESPECTED

Media Quality	Social Class			
	Low		High	
Low	18%	(5/28)	56%	(5/9)
High	20%	(1/5)	50%	(14/28)

TABLE VI - 18

SOCIAL CLASS, MEDIA QUALITY AND PERCENT
SPECIFIC EMPLOYMENT PERCEIVED

Media Quality	Social Class			
	Low		High	
Low	43%	(12/28)	67%	(6/9)
High	40%	(2/5)	71%	(20/28)

tuals, and thus couldn't say who they thought highly of, and what types they didn't respect. Answers such as "I respect all those that in my definition are intellectuals" reveal some familiarity with the characteristics of the intellectual.

Another descriptive variable in which Social Class is more significant in determining response than is Media Quality is the percentage of Specific Employments of intellectuals, shown in Table VI - 18. In dichotomizing this variable we considered responses to be 'vague' if they said that intellectual occupations varied, or that such types held 'important' but unstipulated jobs; and 'specific' responses were those mentioning university research or teaching, professional fields such as medicine, etc. While 40% of Low Status respondents irregardless of media level answered specifically, over two-thirds of respondents of High Social Class did so. This indicates that familiarity is greater to those persons with higher educations, more professional or managerial jobs, and probably more social contacts with occupations in which they consider intellectuals concentrate. Another possible interpretation is that the professional-managerial respondent wishes to credit his own socio-economic group with intellectualism, so he replies that intellectuals work in occupations similar to his own. A high number of 'specific' responses is not found with High Quality media no matter what the status, so we cannot say that more specific occupational images are available from one level that are not shown at the lower quality-level.

Somewhat similar are the responses to the perception of Introverted types as typical intellectuals found in Table VI - 19. Since this variable was dichotomized 'introvert'--'extrovert', it is evident that the higher status respondents stress introversion, and the lower class perceive

extroversion. Over half of the High Class group regard the intellectual as a book-worm rather than a community leader.

It will be recalled from Chapter V, that the physical image of Ichabod Crane or Robert Stanfield went along with the introverted personality perception of the intellectual.²³ Where had High Social Class respondents obtained the image of studiousness, serious bearing, continual reading that made up this stereotype? From their contacts with university professors or researchers in industry? Clearly Table VI - 19 shows it was not from visual or auditory descriptions on the media, for quality levels are unrelated to a high percentage of introvert-perceptions. Only further study can show why the Low Social Class group, particularly those who also use Low Quality media perceive the typical intellectual as a highly educated expert, an advisor-authority ready to give advice to everyone, a tweedy sort with a twinkle in his eye. It should also be recalled that the Low Status group are vague in perceptions of both intellectual characteristics, and in occupational imagery. Perhaps they have made simplistic generalizations that so-called intellectuals are bright, well-educated high-status authority figures, who somehow are to be looked to for advice on running the city or the country. But the High Status respondents have been much more specific in their descriptions of intellectual characteristics and employments in academic and professional fields, in respect of 'true' ones, and now in supposed personality-introversion of intellectuals.

The advisor-authority image is particularly relevant to social class attributes of Low status people. It is logical for the poorly educated, low working-class subject to associate the word 'intellectual' with an elite image of someone whose brains and education give him

TABLE VI - 19

SOCIAL CLASS, MEDIA QUALITY AND PERCENT
INTROVERTS OF "TYPICAL INTELLECTUAL"

Media Quality	Social Class			
	Low		High	
Low	14%	(4/28)	56%	(5/9)
High	40%	(2/5)	57%	(16/28)

TABLE VI - 20

SOCIAL CLASS, MEDIA QUALITY AND PERCENT
SOCIETAL GOALS PERCEIVED

Media Quality	Social Class			
	Low		High	
Low	39%	(11/28)	67%	(6/9)
High	20%	(1/5)	57%	(16/28)

leadership in problems of daily living. They are not as familiar with so-called men of ideas as are the higher status citizens, who think that the intellectual-type is sometimes accompanied by reticent, contemplative characteristics, that 'scholarship' does not infer public relations to distribute the new ideas.

The perceived goals and pursuits of intellectuals were dichotomized to reveal what proportion of the various respondents stressed the 'social change' goal discussed above. The variable was cut as 'societal' and 'personal' goal responses, the latter including both groups of status-seeking and personal fulfillment-seeking replies. Table VI - 20 shows the percentage stressing 'societal' goals were overwhelmingly the High Social Class group. There is some small association of the tendency to view intellectual goals as 'societal' with persons exposed to Low Quality media, but this is overshadowed by the tendency for high status persons to answer this way. For the Low socio-economic group, particularly those of High Media Quality, intellectuals are generally thought to pursue personal goals. These might be status, or the fulfillment of scholastic hopes--it may be the latter category which more of the High-Quality-exposed stress.

This finding is in keeping with the previous table, showing that to the Low status group, the typical intellectual is an expert, leader-extrovert. It follows that for them, he would have the community's interests at heart to some extent, but he might be climbing the ladder of personal status. Even if his role seems to be somewhat vaguely that of the advisor-authority, it would appear to a Low Status observer that he really wanted power and prestige, fame and "lots of money". For those exposed to higher education and the indoctrination into a professional

career of their own, the ideal goal of 'societal improvement' as a responsibility of men of knowledge may have been strongly inculcated. Thus, although it is clear that between half and two-thirds of the High status respondents view the intellectual as pursuing a societal goal, this is not incompatible with their image of him as scholar. To some, apparently near 40%, the scholar connotes someone pursuing a very personalized course, seeking his own satisfaction. But to the majority of High Status respondents, the scholar, who is clearly employed in academic or professional jobs, is working to advance knowledge for the good of the community. Interpretation is hampered not only by the concentration of replies in this category, but by the probable idealization of a goal that should be pursued.

We shall delay consideration of the tabulation of variables showing attitudes toward the intellectual by class and media quality until after Research Question Five has introduced the evaluative data.

Research Question Five

In introducing the questions in the interview which probed attitudes toward the intellectual, Chapter V outlined positive, ambivalent, and negative expressions of attitude. The present section will examine data bearing on social class differences in attitudes toward intellectuals.

Social Class and Attitudes toward Intellectuals

Praise of persons categorized by intellectuals was expressed at several levels in approval and commendation of either their acts or their perceived characters, and sometimes in idealization of their special qualities. Social class differences were notable in the extent of positive and indifferent feelings in the question which asked respondents what kinds of intellectuals they respected. Table VI - 21 reveals that

TABLE VI - 21

RESPECT FOR INTELLECTUALS BY SOCIAL CLASS SCORE

Social Class Score	Respect for Intellectuals				Totals*
	All "true" ones	Upright "models"	Other "activists"	Don't Know	
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Low	5 (20)	3 (30)	7 (50)	12 (63)	27 (40)
Middle	1 (4)	4 (40)	5 (36)	5 (26)	15 (22)
High	19 (76)	3 (30)	2 (14)	2 (11)	26 (38)
Totals	25	10	14	19	68

$$\chi^2 = 18.293 \quad (df=6) \quad .01 \quad P \quad .001$$

* Less 2 who did not answer.

TABLE VI - 22

ATTITUDE TO CRITICISM FUNCTION OF INTELLECTUALS BY SOCIAL CLASS SCORE

Social Class Score	Attitude to Criticism				Totals
	Approve generally	Qualified approval	Don't approve	Indifferent	
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Low	10 (34)	5 (29)	9 (45)	4 (100)	28 (40)
Middle	7 (24)	4 (24)	5 (25)	0 (0)	16 (23)
High	12 (41)	8 (47)	6 (30)	0 (0)	26 (37)
Totals	29	17	20	4	70

$$\chi^2 = 11.308 \quad (df=6) \quad .10 \quad P \quad .05$$

the chi-square was significant between .01 and .001. The largest percentage of Low Social Class respondents, twelve of twenty-seven, 44%, did not know what kinds they respected and what kinds they disrespected. Many said they could not answer because they did not know intellectuals personally. Quite opposite was the response of the High Social Class--nineteen of the twenty-six, 73%, claimed to respect all 'true' intellectuals, some restricting these to their own definitions. Just as the twelve Low status people who said 'Don't know' were 63% of the responses of that type, so the nineteen High status replies stressing 'All true ones' were 76% of that category. The latter reflect a positive stereotype toward the intellectual, according respect automatically to persons they consider intellectuals.

Of the Low Class respondents who were able to discuss their respect for intellectuals, seven, over one-quarter, said that they respected those who were rendering service in a busy and productive way. Usually the fourteen who mentioned this type of activism which they respected, contrasted it with 'leeching' or lack of production. The Activity-dimension of attitude responses was discussed in Chapter V,²⁴ in contrast to the Morality-dimension. Responses to several attitude questions differentiated people who conceived of the intellectual as either productive or ineffectual. In the present case, only two High Social Class respondents view the respect question in terms of activism, while twelve people with lower status feel that they can most respect the ones who "make good use of what they have--use brain to fullest extent".²⁵

The third category of response to the question was in terms of respect for what we call 'models', intellectuals of impeccably upright

character, whose morals are unquestionable and whose motives are unselfish. Of the ten who mentioned this aspect, four are Middle Class, but similar numbers are found at all levels. Whereas more Middle status respondents had mentioned activism or that they didn't know what intellectuals to respect, this is the second-most mentioned category for the highest status. The attitude appears to be that respect is only due to the exemplary, that the so-called intellectual is one of the societal heroes, but that respect will be denied him if he acts villainous or foolish. The lack of differentiation of this Morality-dimension between the social class levels will be examined in further questions.

Most of the respondents who found it possible to answer the question of respect for intellectuals, 25 or 37% of the 68, emphasized either that they were in awe of all intellectuals, or that they respected all those they considered worthy of the label of 'intellectual'. Again, an underlying suspicion is revealed that their idol may have feet of clay, and that if the intellectual person proves himself wanting of some 'true' characteristic, he will no longer be called an intellectual. The Middle Class respondents are not in evidence in this general response of respect for all true intellectuals--they have made their reservations, whether activist or moral, clear in detail. Are there so many High Social Class respondents here because they are reluctant to voice their misgivings about what types they define not to be worthy of respect? The implication is better analyzed by examining another question which tapped the attitudes of respondents toward the intellectual.

Social Class and Approval of Intellectual Criticism

The question which asked whether subjects agreed that the job of intellectuals was to comment on and criticize the society, is tabulated

with Social Class Scores in Table VI - 22. The data show that the relationship between responses and social class position is nearly significant at the .05 level.

Nearly the same numbers of Low Social Class respondents approve of the statement as disapprove. Ten and nine respectively, but the proportionate contributions to these categories are somewhat different. The nine Low status people who disapprove of intellectual criticism are the majority who feel this way, 45%. But the ten who approve the role are just over one-third who agree that intellectuals should comment and criticize. A genuine attitude difference within a social strata seems to exist--some said yes, since they know more they should be the ones to do the criticizing, and others said no, they have no more right than anybody else to criticize. Are the nine disapproving respondents jealous of what some perceived an elite status for intellectuals, and now are trying to insist on a democratic right that everyone may make comments about their society? The quotations made in the previous chapter of the respondents who disagreed, uphold this implication.²⁶ Some respondents, and 55% of them are higher in status, claimed that their right was no more than others', while others said that they should not dictate, or tell other people what to do.

What initially appears difficult to interpret in the table, the similar numbers of Low and High Class respondents who approved the intellectual's criticism role, can be viewed from two stances. The Low Status respondents stressed the superior ability of so-called intellectuals to understand, and therefore a natural or acquired right to be societal critics. Some imputed high motivations to them, as we have seen in the responses to the goal question, and therefore trusted their

comments to be in the best societal interests. The higher status respondents appeared to approve of intellectual criticism as part of the intellectual role, and for that to be expected from persons so categorized. There is almost an elitist assumption in certain responses which inferred that the higher the ability, the more right to influence the society.

Qualified approval was given by eight High status respondents, who constituted 47% of those answers, and who were careful to limit their approval to criticism which attempted to correct social ills, and did not condemn for the sake of condemnation. Some of the higher status comments stressed that the criticism should be well-founded, and that intellectuals "shouldn't be criticizing if they don't know." A minority of the qualifications were phrased in terms of the sensibility of the criticism--that there were times and topics which ought not to result in criticism--as if there were sacred cows which ought not to be challenged. The answers emphasizing qualified approval were stressed second to general approval by High Social Class respondents, but third by those of lower status.

In comparing Tables VI - 21 and 22, we see that the High status respondents who claim to respect all 'true' intellectuals have spread themselves somewhat into the reserved approval of intellectual criticism, their enthusiasm may have been superficial, and indeed, they may have been reluctant to say that there were intellectuals they did not respect. It becomes more evident, however, that the moral demands made upon the so-called intellectual are great--he must have an upright character and total lack of subversive motives, he must be energetic in espousing societal causes, and he must only express his criticisms of his community when they have been researched and are intended to improve the situation.

Some respondents attest to the superior rights and abilities of the intellectual, and give him automatic support, but others are suspicious of any special status, and insist that the intellectual role has privileges but these may be forfeited.

Social Class and Restrictions on Teachers

In turning from positive responses, to a question which further mined the ambivalence and negative attitudes of respondents, we examine one of a series of questions which asked what limits respondents would place on events or people. After questions on those who might be prevented from demonstrating or marching, a question was put which asked the respondent whether there were teachers he might restrict from teaching--and if so, what types of people these teachers would be. Thus, indirectly, we obtained further evidence of the Morality-dimension in the attitude data, which showed how intellectuals might walk a narrow path between acceptance and rejection by citizens.

Table VI - 23 compares Social Class Scores with restrictions on the freedom of teachers to teach, with a significant chi-square between .05 and .02 levels. The most liberal respondents are eight Low Social Class subjects, who make up 73% of that level, but only 29% of all Low status replies. These respondents seemed surprised at the question, replying that if a teacher was hired to teach, it would not be right for a parent or citizen to interfere, that teachers were necessary, and should be permitted every liberty. Few others perceived the question this simply.

Nearly half of the seventy responses, thirty-one, wanted to restrict extremists of suspicious political, religious, ethical or moral characters. The table shows that objections of this type increased with

TABLE VI - 23

RESTRICTIONS ON TEACHERS' FREEDOM BY SOCIAL CLASS SCORE

Social Class Score	Restrict Teachers' Freedom				Totals
	No Restriction	Other & Don't Know*	Restrict Unqualified	Restrict Extremists	
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Low	8 (73)	4 (50)	10 (50)	6 (19)	28 (40)
Middle	1 (9)	0 (0)	4 (20)	11 (35)	16 (23)
High	2 (18)	4 (50)	6 (30)	14 (45)	26 (37)
Totals	11	8	20	31	70

$$\chi^2 = 14.134 \quad (df=6) \quad .05 \quad P \quad .02$$

* Includes 2 "Don't know" and 6 "Other" replies

TABLE VI - 24

RESTRICTION ON TEACHERS' FREEDOM BY AREA OF RESIDENCE

Restrict Teachers' Freedom	Area of Residence		Totals
	Flats	Heights	
	(%)	(%)	(%)
No restrictions	8 (22)	3 (9)	11 (16)
Other & Don't Know	5 (14)	3 (9)	8 (11)
Restrict Unqualified	14 (39)	6 (18)	20 (29)
Restrict Extremists	9 (25)	22 (65)	31 (44)
Totals	36	34	70

$$\chi^2 = 11.365 \quad (df=3) \quad P \quad .01$$

social class, from six of Low status to fourteen of High Class. The last-named constitute 45% of such restrictive answers, and 54% of High status replies. These are the upper-middle-class parents who are concerned with any potential atheism or Communism or homosexuality on the part of teachers--"we won't have our kids being taught by suspicious characters". The stated fears are political and religious, justified by reference to being good Canadians and good Christians. It is worth recalling that for the most part, the respondents were married, predominantly females, in their late thirties or early forties, when their children would be in public school. They reacted strongly to this question in a protectionist manner.

Yet, a topical reason can be made for such a large number of responses to wish to restrict teachers of extremist religious or political views. As the introductory chapter described, the data was collected at the time of a scandal and dismissal regarding a high school teacher in the Edmonton district, who was accused of atheism and of criticizing the government in his classroom.²⁷ Many parents had been incensed at the prospect of students being asked to proclaim their religious faith by a teacher who claimed to have none, and respondents referred to the case in their responses to this question. Particularly the upper-middle-class had encouraged the teacher's dismissal--whether this evidenced simply a higher level of concern for the content of their children's educations, or a tendency toward conservatism that the lower status respondents did not have, cannot be known on the basis of our data. But it is evident from the table that the Low status respondents were much more permissive of teachers and their political or religious views than were the High status group.²⁸

When we examine the third response category, however, additional light is thrown on the question. Ten Low status respondents, 50% of the replies, but more of this status-group than any other response category, would restrict the poorly qualified from teaching. This view was expressed by six High Status respondents, who generally expressed concern with the education levels of teachers, and with their suitability for teaching. Many respondents of all status levels merely said that teachers would have to meet all the requirements of the educationists before they should be allowed to teach, but a minority stressed that only people who really liked teaching should be in that profession. Thus, there were to be restrictions on those who viewed teaching as easy work, but who were not committed to the instruction of young minds. Again, an ideal has been voiced, revealing that respondents would like to purify the teaching profession till all its members have been proven to be dedicated. Another example of intolerance for low motives, for selfishness and status-seeking, has been revealed.

In order to see whether or not the two types of restrictions on teachers were specific to either area sample, a tabulation of Flats and Heights with the variable was made. The results are shown in Table VI - 24, significant at the .01 level. More than double the number of qualifications are found in the Flats than in the Heights--fourteen to six. Similarly, more than double the number who are concerned about the religious or political extremism of teachers are found in the Heights rather than the Flats--twenty-two to nine. Only three Heights residents are willing to allow all teachers unrestricted freedom of access to teaching, while eight Flats residents place no restrictions. Clearly, the Low status adults are concerned that the people who teach really are

suitable and amply qualified to teach--if this demand is met, they are content to allow unlimited freedoms to people who want to teach. Obviously, paper qualifications are not sufficient for the respondents from the upper-middle-class neighborhood. They want to be sure that teachers are upright, appropriate role-models for their children--to be assured that no subversion of their values will occur in the classroom.

The intellectual as teacher seems to be emasculated into a societal yes-man. Indeed, Hofstadter, Coser and Gurko had documented the North American tendency to severely judge its teachers, and to exalt 'the scholar' to inhuman levels of uncorruptibility.²⁹ When an intellectual is forbidden to criticize if he has nothing constructive to say, when he is censured if atheistic, or too far left or right of the political norm, when homosexuality is despised but virility suspect--then surely he is perceived from an attitude of anti-intellectualism. We have been drawing together the themes in a number of attitude questions which were included in the interview, and have derived a somewhat inhuman portrait. A final example, which relates to a perception of a personality trait, illustrates the stereotype of the intellectual that exists.

As the previous chapter outlined, near the end of the interview, respondents were asked if they thought that intellectuals were lonely people, and if so why, or if not, why not. The themes of work involvement and communicability were noted in responses both positive and negative. Table VI - 25 shows that while a tabulation with the Social Class Score is insignificant at .30, interesting tendencies appear.

The respondents who stress intellectual work, either from the view that the intellectual is not lonely because he is wrapped up in his

TABLE VI - 25

SOCIAL CLASS SCORE AND PERCEIVED LONELINESS OF INTELLECTUALS

Social Class Score	Perceived Loneliness of Intellectual										Totals	
	No, Working		No, Communi- cates		Don't Know		Yes, Isolated Career		Yes, Can't Communi- cate			
		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)
Low	9	(38)	5	(29)	5	(71)	6	(50)	3	(30)	28	(40)
Middle	7	(29)	4	(24)	0	(0)	4	(33)	1	(10)	16	(23)
High	8	(33)	8	(47)	2	(29)	2	(17)	6	(60)	26	(37)
Totals	24		17		7		12		10		70	
$\chi^2 = 9.469$												
(df=8)												
P .30												

TABLE VI - 26

RESPONDENTS SUBSCRIBING TO VARIOUS VIEWS OF INTELLECTUALS

<u>Classification of Respondents</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>(%)</u>
Classic 'Man-of-Ideas' View	20	(29)
'Superior' Positive Stereotype	15	(21)
'Oddball' Negative Stereotype	14	(20)
Ambivalent-mixed View	9	(13)
Initial 'Don't Know' without Referent for Intellectual	12	(17)
Total Sample	70	(100)

work, or from the standpoint that the intellectual must work alone and therefore is lonely--tend to be Low in Social Class, for there are fifteen of them and ten High Class respondents stressing work. The reverse is a tendency of those who emphasize communication-- fourteen are High in status, while eight are Low Class who discuss loneliness or lack of it because of communication. In other words, the higher the status, the more the responses concentrate on the importance of communication. Unfortunately, the lack of significance of the tabulation precludes any other inference about social class and the perception of loneliness of intellectuals.

Summary: Stereotyped Views and "Classic" Views

In order to summarize the section, we will utilize Hofstadter's definition of the intellectual as a person who lives for ideas, not off them.³⁰ Table VI - 26 presents this as the classic definition, and we see that nearly thirty per cent of the sample's respondents utilized it in answering the first two questions on the label and the typical intellectual. This finding means that there are twenty respondents for whom the category 'intellectual' calls up the same social type as it does for the in-group of those like Hofstadter who write about the intellectual. This is a much higher percentage than might have been expected, if it were not for the fact that so many of the Heights sub-sample were university-educated.

Positive idealization of the man of knowledge has been alluded to in discussion of such responses as the 'social change' goal. The table indicates that there are fifteen respondents who do idealize the intellectual when defining him initially. This milieu for subsequent questions in the interview indicates that one-fifth of the responses

would be stereotypes in the heroic direction. However, almost the same number of responses, fourteen, or 20%, were of a negative, derogatory type. To these respondents, again totalling one-fifth of the sample, the intellectual is odd, bookish, cold and inhuman.

Hence, for a total of 29 persons, a stereotyped definition was made initially. These are the out-group, for whom the referent 'intellectual' does not call up either a body of literature on that social type, as it may for the twenty who used a near-classic definition. Instead, there are extreme points of view of the man of knowledge as a brilliant expert, or a bookish fogey. A remainder of nine respondents were hard to classify because of a mixture of opinions and sentiments in their answers. Some replied that they thought of people they knew as intellectuals, and yet could imagine that there were other meanings than their own. Some expressed a combination of stereotypes, the expert of superior brainpower, for example who was also described as more interested in book-reading than in talking to ordinary people. The nine respondents fell into an 'other' category of combinations of stereotypes and more realistic conceptions. We have tallied separately those twelve respondents, 17% of the sample, who found it impossible to describe the intellectual in the first questions asked about his traits--they have no ready referent. These people will be discussed next as a hard core extreme out-group, unable to conceptualize the intellectual, given that label. Whether these people were unable to muster the verbosity that the others did, or whether they genuinely did not have any category, is unknown.

Thus, a complete range of response has been reported, from the historian's conceptualization to various types of stereotyping, to an

utter inability to categorize the intellectual. We consider that Table VI - 26 presents a fair sampling of definitions.

Attitude Variables, Class and Media

In order to show the effect of both social class and the quality of media exposure on evaluational variables, we turn to the percentage tabulations of attitude items. With these, social class is less clearly the determinant than it was with the cognitive variables. As the previous section has discussed, the attitudes toward intellectuals were not expressed in a way easily measured by our indicators. Nonetheless, the variables to be discussed here have been dichotomized in as meaningful a manner as possible.

Direct variation between class and quality variables is evident in Table VI - 27, showing the percentage who wished to restrict teachers from access to classes. The high percentages show that this is a general consensus, as previously discussed, most respondents wanted restrictions placed on some teachers. It is impossible to say whether directionality is from class or quality, however nearly all High Social Class respondents replied in this way. The most restrictiveness is from High Status respondents of Low Media Quality, and the least is from the Low Status group with Low Media Quality-exposure. With only 32% restrictive replies, they are the deviant cases here, few differences exist between the other cells. The High Status group and the High Quality group are both highly suspicious of granting unlimited freedoms of access to teachers, so that we know only that quality and status are both important. Perhaps the consensus on this item, which was one of the Anti-Intellectualism Score items, helped prevent that score from discriminating among respondents. Possibly the high status and high

TABLE VI - 27

SOCIAL CLASS, MEDIA QUALITY AND PERCENT
RESTRICT TEACHERS

Media Quality	Social Class			
	Low		High	
Low	32%	(9/28)	89%	(8/9)
High	80%	(4/5)	75%	(21/28)

TABLE VI - 28

SOCIAL CLASS, MEDIA QUALITY AND PERCENT
MANY NEGATIVE ADJECTIVES

Media Quality	Social Class			
	Low		High	
Low	39%	(11/28)	33%	(3/9)
High	0%	(0/5)	25%	(7/28)

quality respondents are all more aware of the power of teachers over young minds, and are reflecting a conservatism based on the fear that their children will be influenced in unfavorable ways by unscreened teachers.³¹ Only the Low Status, Low Quality respondents may trust teachers, a speculation we have made before.

A tabulation which examines the proportion of respondents who were willing to appear verbally anti-intellectual is shown in Table VI - 28, the percentage who chose many negative adjectives from the list. We dichotomized the adjective variable so that 'few' would be none to two named, and 'many' would be three or more adjectives from the list selected as representing the respondent's view of the intellectual. As the table shows, most respondents were not in the 'many'-choice category, but definite differences exist between those who are considered so. Quality of media is the important determinant, for over one-third of the Low Quality-exposed respondents are selective of a high number of negative adjectives. Social Class is of less importance, but it is notable that there are no respondents with Low Status and High Quality of media involvement who chose many adjectives. By the appearance of greater hostility accompanying low levels of media involvement, the issue is raised that it may be from 'lowcult' media that respondents learn negative images of the intellectual. However, this causal implication cannot be known, we can only note the trend for the most hostile item in the interview schedule, the deliberate choice of negatively stereotyped adjectives, to differentiate quality levels.³²

Another attitude item is shown in Table VI - 29, the percentage who qualify their approval of the criticism function of so-called intellectuals. The variable was not simply dichotomized, but considered

TABLE VI - 29

SOCIAL CLASS, MEDIA QUALITY AND PERCENT

QUALIFIED APPROVAL OF CRITICISM

Media Quality	Social Class			
	Low		High	
Low	11%	(3/28)	22%	(2/9)
High	40%	(2/5)	36%	(10/28)

TABLE VI - 30

SOCIAL CLASS, MEDIA QUALITY AND PERCENT

DISAPPROVAL OF CRITICISM

Media Quality	Social Class			
	Low		High	
Low	36%	(10/28)	44%	(4/9)
High	20%	(1/5)	18%	(5/28)

in percentages of those whose approval was total, those who qualified their agreement, and those who disapproved. Almost no differences between cells of respondents who approved was found, so that table is not presented. The range of percentages of respondents generally approving was from 33% (High Status, Low Quality) to 46% (High Status, High Quality). However, more interesting is the table presented, with those whose approval was couched in reservations, which were discussed in Chapter V.³³ We shall discuss this table and the next together: for Table VI - 30 shows the proportion who disapproved of intellectuals' criticizing the society.

In both tables, quality of media exposure is more determinant of response than is social class. The respondents whose media quality levels are high are more likely to express hesitant approval of criticism than are those of low quality. We might speculate that at the highest levels of media quality the traditional role of intellectuals in writing critical comments is widely known, and that these respondents are simply more acceptant because they recognize criticism as a legitimate function of the so-called intellectual. Very few respondents of Low Media Quality risked giving qualified approval to the criticism function. Whether their image of the intellectual is most clearly that of expert-leader-advisor who would be undermining his position of authority if he criticized his community, reluctant approval is more closely associated with low social class than with low quality of media.

Notably, the second table shows that disapproval is more associated with low quality than with low class. The item is very similar to the distribution in the total Anti-Intellectualism Score, with the highest quality level more positive, or in this case, more permissive.

The Low status, Low quality group had been the smallest cell giving qualified approval, and 36% of them flatly disapprove of intellectual criticism. This group were typically frank throughout the interview, not afraid to express blunt awe or blunt disapproval of men of ideas.³⁴

The proportion of disapproval of the criticism function is inverse to quality of media exposure. If one disapproves of the intellectual-as-critic, probably one has been exposed to low level of media which may transmit a clear stereotype toward the failure of elites to live up to roles of leadership, along with a suspicion that these people basically work for themselves, and might sell out their responsibility. These speculations cannot be known because insufficient data on the subject was obtained from this survey. The Anti-Intellectualism of pulp magazines was ably charted by Leo Gurko, and we devoted proportions of the second chapter to the strain toward hostility to intellectuals in low quality American mass media.³⁵

Respondents Who Said "Don't Know"

While most of the seventy respondents answered the series of questions pertaining to the intellectual, a core of eleven respondents answered "Don't Know" to more than a third of these questions. We shall consider the traits of these people, who by their admissions of ignorance were the most unfamiliar with the intellectual social type. The eleven respondents most ignorant of the image of the intellectual replied with "don't know" to over four of the twelve intellectual variables studied. We trace first their patterns of response to the questions on the intellectual, then their socio-economic and media involvement characteristics.

These people were overwhelmingly unable to answer the initial question on the meaning of the label 'an intellectual'. If they could

answer what were traits of the typical intellectual, it was in terms of his high education and status--the intellectual as elite-expert. Fairly high-status careers were attributed by these respondents--from professional to political-economic occupations were perceived. When they were asked about intellectual goals, their view was that he was pursuing status and money. If they could answer the question about schooling necessary for intellectualism, it was to say that 'lots' was needed, rarely to specify how much. They felt that intellectuals are special, are 'better' than ordinary people. Attitude questions showed more frequent 'don't know' replies by this group than the cognitive, descriptive questions had revealed. When asked their attitude to the criticism function of intellectuals, they usually did not know, or said they disapproved of that role. Asked if they could list the types of intellectuals they respected, most could not, claiming not to know any. They had no knowledge of 'real' traits of intellectuals, contrasted to 'phony' ones. Their most permissive answers came on the question about restricting teachers from the classroom, where they predominantly said they would not place restriction on particular types of teachers. And if they had any image about the intellectual as a lonely person, it was in terms of his work: some saying that he was so absorbed in it as not to be lonely, some saying its isolation make him feel lonely.

Six of the eleven 'don't know' respondents had received less than nine years of schooling, and the other five were within nine to twelve years. Nine of them had Social Class Scores in the Low category of four to eight points; and only two were Middle Social Class or residents of the Heights.

The mean Social Class Score of these eleven respondents was 6.9,

whereas that for the other 59 respondents was 10.9. Their mean exposure to media was 7.3 items, while the other respondents averaged 11.5 items. Medians of quality scores for the so-called 'don't know' group were at the 1.5 level of media quality, while the others averaged above 2.5. Their quantity and quality of exposure to the mass media was significantly below the rest of the sample, and their lack of response to the descriptive variables indicates that they do not personally have a clear mental image of 'the intellectual'. If other social types had been included, we might have tested their general facility with social typing.

Academics and Perceived Public Attitudes

In order to place the attitudes of respondents against a sounding-board of perceptions of supposed intellectuals, we turn to the reactions of the Academics, the sample of seventeen professors.

Earlier in this chapter, it was reported that the Academic respondents felt that manual workers had a negative stereotype of the typical intellectual. A further question was added to the professors' interviews, to see whether they considered the public to be anti-intellectual or not. The question was directed toward their perception of the Edmonton community's feelings. The Academic replies do not paint a rosy picture, for fourteen of the seventeen expect either ambivalent, indifferent, or outright hostile feelings from most citizens. Their positive comments might total six, and include such reserved statements as "it's more hospitable than some"; "it depends. ."; "awe or wonderment, when not indifference".

Three of the professors say that 50% of Edmontonians may be ambivalent, and the other 50% express varying acceptance. Seven of them consider citizens to be hostile, against and even afraid of intellectuals.

Several direct quotations illustrate:

"It 'suffers' them. Does not appreciate them and spawns a great number of pseudo-intellectuals as a result."

"Still a fairly widespread attitude of hostility, prejudice in some groups. (In secondary school system, promoted ones are yes-men.) If an intellectual stays here ten years, he settles into the system, is absorbed into hostility."

"A mixture: afraid or in awe of them. Those close enough to want to send kids to university show awe mixed with contempt (intellectuals don't earn a living). Fear we don't accept the same concepts and values."

When the academics were asked about the views of one particular category of the public, politicians, their answers were less clearcut. Six commented that local politicians distrust the so-called intellectual, while federal politicians utilize the type. Four more commented that some parties are favorable, others are not. Three felt to some extent that politicians are dependent on intellectuals for expertise, and one said simply that they are tolerated. To another three of the professors, politicians distrust intellectuals generally, and to one, the intellectual seems to play such a minimal role that politicians must be indifferent toward the type. Varied answers are thus reported, and the only consensus seems to be that in Alberta, or with the present government, distrust and anti-intellectualism is evident. Nine of the seventeen Academics expressed the pessimistic view that politicians distrust intellectuals to some extent.

Similar divergence of opinion was expressed by the Academic group when asked what proportion of intellectuals would be considered to be atheists. Five felt that one-quarter or less of the men of ideas would be considered atheists by public opinion. Three more thought that half

would be a better guess; and six of the professors felt that the majority of men of ideas would be viewed as atheists. Only one respondent thought that the public would view all intellectuals this way, and another two replied that the number was inexact, it would depend.

Two modes were found in these replies: nearly one-third of the Academics thought that very few intellectuals would be called atheists, while another seven felt that most were so considered. As much stereotyping exists from the academics toward the community as does the other way; just as was found when Seeman studied intellectuals as minority group members.³⁶

To summarize this section, it is evident that a mixture of attitudes typify our respondents. To particular questions they are more permissive or more restrictive toward the intellectual, depending whether they view his position and role positively or negatively. Studied by socio-economic status, it appears that the upper status respondents think that they are being positive, but in such issues as the freedom of various kinds of teachers to have access to classrooms, they are more hostile than are the lower status subjects. Low class respondents polarize much further into those very much in favor of intellectuals, or those highly suspicious of intellectual roles and the types of individuals who fill them. We have also noted that the respondents with the highest number of 'don't know' answers are lower in status and media involvement than are the rest of the sample. The academic sub-group anticipated a more highly negative attitude than was expressed by our respondents. Whether this would be borne out if subjects were not so polite, or the questions were more carefully probative of attitudes, is unknown. Clearly, our respondents are more ambivalent toward intellectuals than

are they hostile, or anti-intellectual.

Summary

In conclusion, we can recapitulate the images which are held by discrete groups of respondents--particularly those whose social class differences are great, and for some variables those whose media involvements were different. The Low Status group held the image of the intellectual as advisor, leader, an extrovert, an expert sometimes seeking his own status goals, sometimes working for the community. Their attitudes toward this type were mixed, they were more willing to let him teach if he was a teacher than were other groups, particularly if they were exposed to a low level of mass media. They disapproved of him much more if they were both low in status and low in quality, on many of the anti-intellectualism items, and in the summed score.

The High status group held the image of the intellectual as a scholar, introverted and studious, working in academic or professional fields, usually for the good of society. They combined respect and suspicion, particularly respectful if their involvement in the mass media was at a high quality-level, more suspicious if they combined high status and low quality. They were more willing to approve of intellectuals as social critics, provided that criticism was constructive, but they were very restrictive of the moral and political qualifications of teachers. They appeared somewhat more Anti-Intellectual than low status respondents of high media quality, but the extent of their anti-intellectualism was not great.

With the clear differences in most of the cognitive-descriptive variables being between the social class groups, it seems apparent that social world differences do contribute strongly toward different con-

ceptions of the intellectual. We have found that most respondents of low social status are also exposed to low quality levels of mass media (of 33, 28 were Low Quality and Five were High Quality). Their social world is that of the poorly educated, blue collar working family, entertained by involvement in sentimental, stereotyped media offerings, mostly television and radio items of immediate impact and either simple endorsement of virtue, or enthrallment with violent adventures. The link between high status and high media quality seems clear, as well, with 28 of the 37 exposed to high levels, and nine exposed to low quality media. Hence the other social world is that of the college-educated professional or managerial white collar family, whose media offerings include the sophisticated sport and fashion worlds, the pleasant family entertainment programs, serious music and controversial discussion shows, with occasional book-reading of a contemplative sort, and many varied magazines in their households. As their social worlds differ, so do their images of the intellectual social type.

FOOTNOTES CHAPTER VI

1. Previously discussed in Chapter 1, pp. 4-6.
2. The Methods chapter has discussed the seventeen professors, who were stratified by faculty and department, as well as by their fame among graduate students, as professors of high intellectual calibre relative to others in the departments.
3. Tamotsu Shibutani, "Preference Groups and Social Control" in Arnold M. Rose, Human Behavior and Social Processes (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1962), pp. 128-147. Shibutani explains that people living in different social worlds have a diversity of perspectives, because they focus on things which are crucial to their own world, and do not communicate extensively with people in other worlds.
4. S. Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956), pp. 140-150.
5. Ibid., p. 247.
6. Ibid., p. 249. In insignificant cases, the sums of ranks are too similar to show that the populations are different.
7. Siegel, ibid., p. 123.
8. In presenting the analysis of intellectual variables by social class, we will pay close attention to the High Social Class Score group (those whose points were from thirteen to sixteen on the Score), and to those in the Low Class category (those whose Social Class Scores ranged from four to eight points). The argument of different social worlds will be better made by examination of the extremes than the middle cases.
9. Melvin Seeman, "The Intellectual and the Language of Minorities", AJS, LXIV, No. 1, (July 1958), pp. 25-35. Seeman is aware that the group most conscious of anti-intellectualism are the so-called intellectuals themselves. This and other findings, cf. note 36 in this chapter, substantiate Seeman's research in our study.
10. Leo Gurko, Heroes, Highbrows and the Popular Mind (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1962), p. 26. He says "The great error, still shared by intellectuals and non-intellectuals alike, is this assumption that a gap must exist between 'intellectual' and 'physical' affairs. Our whole historical experience shows that, in actuality, no such gap exists, and that when people have acted on the assumption that it does, only damage and confusion have resulted." Merle Curti's essay "Intellectuals and Other People" AHP, LX, 2 (January, 1955), pp. 259-282, is aimed at narrowing the gap which is acknowledged to exist between North Americans who may be classed as intellectuals and non-intellectuals. Hofstadter's comments were cited in the Introductory chapter, p. 9.

11. Social Class Scores, when tabulated with "Specialness" of Intellectuals showed a chi-square insignificant at .85, near random.
12. Cf. Chapter III, pp. 82-83, and Appendix II.
13. Cf. Chapter V, pp. 147-148, and also Lewis Coser's Men of Ideas (New York: The Free Press, 1965) which is the most recent tracing of intellectual affiliations in America.
14. Six respondents chose 'politician' as a possible job for intellectuals to be frequenting.
15. The classical view of the intellectual's occupation as philosopher, poet, essayist, was alluded to in both Chapters I and II.
16. Cf. Chapter V, pp. 154-155.
17. Cf. Chapter v, pp. 151-153.
18. It is difficult to quantify responses which seemed cynical, for tone may have been as important as the actual words used, but it was not recorded on the interview schedule.
19. Quoted in Chapter V, p. 155.
20. "The knowledge-factor" infers that a traditional trait or role of so-called intellectuals has been handed down as part of the connotation of the social type. For example, they like to 'play with ideas' for their 'own fun', cf. Hofstadter, op. cit., p. 27.
21. The "evaluation" means that a judgment had to be made by the respondent as to the benefit or liability of a particular intellectual trait or role, as for example, criticizing his society.
22. "Specific" replies were those thirty responses which were classed "wide knowledge" or "scholarly interests", for intellectual characteristics. "Vague" replies stressed "don't know", "status", or "intelligence". Clearly, the "specific" group were more explicitly able to describe traditionally recognized intellectual traits than such suggestions of vaguely 'elite' status or 'smartness'.
23. Cf. Chapter V, pp. 141-143.
24. Cf. Chapter V, p. 161.
25. The quotes from respondent interviews all were introduced in Chapter V, pp. 160-161.
26. Cf. Chapter V, pp. 166-167.
27. Chapter I presents the details under the section on The Local Situation, pp. 11-13.

28. Methodologically, however, there may be an explanation. By the time of greatest press coverage of the teacher's suspension, most of the interviews in the Flats had been obtained. Hence, nearly one-third of the lower-status interviews may have been completed before the case was widely publicized.
29. Richard Hofstadter, in his chapter on "The School and the Teacher", in Anti-Intellectualism in American Life (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963) traces the distrust of schoolmen which is pervasive in the North American culture. This view is upheld by Lewis Coser, op. cit., cf. Chapter II, p. 58.
30. Hofstadter, ibid., p. 27.
31. It is also important to recall that the data was collected while the Edmonton press was reporting the suspension of the teacher for alleged atheism, as was discussed in Chapter I. The furor over his case may have totally distorted the response that a 'restrict teachers' question might have had at another time. Particularly the high status respondents may appear more restrictive than normally, since the case was in the newspapers at the time of the interviews in the Heights.
32. Some of the negative adjective-phrases which were chosen were clearly pejorative: 'insufferable brains' (six choices), 'mad genius' types (nine choices), 'dangerous to public welfare' (five choices). Less negative stereotypes were included, such as 'snobs' (ten choices), 'absent-minded' (thirteen choices), and 'impractical dreamers' (eight choices). There were a total of eleven negative adjectives and as many positive phrases to select.
33. Usually, the reservations questioned the right of intellectuals to be societal critics more than other citizens, or expressed the hope that criticism should be constructive if made publically. Chapter V discussed the item in detail.
34. Verbal facility in responding to the questions, and willingness to reply frankly to the interviewer, are both limitations of the data which will be discussed in the Concluding chapter.
35. Leo Gurko, loc. cit., also dealt with in Chapter II, pp. 47-55.
36. Melvin Seeman, "The Intellectual and the Language of Minorities", AJS, LXIV (July, 1958), pp. 25-35. On page 29: "This direct acceptance by intellectuals of the negative stereotype regarding intellectuals follows the pattern of the minority 'self-hate' which Lewin has described in the case of the anti-Semitic Jew and which has been clearly expressed in Negro color attitudes."

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

It frequently happens that the investigator himself is aware that his data constitute only a very limited reflection of the concept he has in mind, but, especially in the early stages of research on a problem, he may not be able to devise a more satisfactory one.

- Sellitz, Deutsch, Jahoda, Cook
Research Methods in Social Relations

In this chapter we will summarize the findings, discuss their sociological and practical implications, and make suggestions for further research.

The present study measured the image and definition of 'the intellectual' among citizens of low-class and upper-middle-class areas of Edmonton, Alberta. Data were obtained by interviews of a sample of seventy adult members of randomly selected households in the two neighborhoods called "The Flats" and "The Heights". This study attempted to show that different conceptions of such social types as 'intellectuals' were held by persons who are members of different social worlds.

Before outlining implications and suggestions for future research, we state a limitation of the present research. One cannot consider that an exploratory study in itself is a limitation of research findings, it is a necessary first step to adding to sociological knowledge about a problem. In this case, however, the size of that step was small, and therefore considerable further exploration is needed. Specifically, the small sample of seventy respondents hampered the statistical treatment of data, the interpretation of cells when divided into The Flats (36 cases) and the Heights (34 cases). Categories were not collapsed beyond

meaningful divisions, but it was impossible to hold variables constant, or to factor any of the intellectual variables for a profile of characteristics. The Academic sample was too small for systematic tabulations and comparison of responses with those from the main sample.

The Findings

The findings show that several complex images of men of knowledge existed amongst the respondents sampled in 1964-65. The intellectual is considered by some to be a man of very high knowledge and education, of considerable expertise--though he may be a generalist or a specialist in a theoretical or applied field. 'Scientist' or 'Professor' are the usual career prototypes for persons thought to be intellectuals, although a minority of the respondents thought that men of knowledge were to be found in such professional fields as medicine, law and social work. The intellectual's potential authority over human lives is considered to be great, though he may spend his days in laboratory or lecture-hall.

In addition to the general characteristics perceived of intellectuals, three physical and personality stereotypes evolved from the data. The intellectual was considered as book-worm, as advisor, and as 'big-shot', with emphasis on the first two mentioned. First, he was thought introverted, bookish, more concerned with the abstract than the concrete, bespectacled and serious, and unwilling to converse about mundane things. On the other hand, he was considered by some respondents to be a friend-in-need, someone to go to for help and advice about problems too difficult to be solved by the layman; physically, a friendly, tweedy, pipe-smoking man behind a desk. Yet, he was also pictured in the same way that scholars of intellectualism have considered him--a man who puts ideas

first, but who is still able to live in a real world--someone who would rather read than play golf, but able to enjoy each at appropriate times. Finally, he was conceptualized by the smallest minority as just another 'bigshot', as a member of the societal elite, rich and unconcerned about the rest of the population.

While most of our respondents credited the intellectual with at least superficially working for the societal good and adding to our knowledge about problems which needed solution for the citizenry, a minority considered him exploitative, and striving for his own fame and fortune. Another group thought that what would please the intellectual most would be his arrival at understanding, his achievement of his personal goals of scholarship and knowledge.

The foregoing summary portrays the content of the image of the intellectual, without indicating which views were held by particular types of respondents. The data were further analyzed in terms of the social class membership and mass media consumption patterns of respondents. It was evident from our data that the cognitive variables relating to the image of the intellectual separated respondents by social class much better than those where evaluation and feeling played a great part. Considered alone, social class was effective in distinguishing respondents in terms of such consideration as the introversion or extroversion of the typical intellectual, the specificity of careers of intellectuals, the status or societal goals of intellectuals.

Considered together with the levels of quality of particular mass media to which respondents were exposed, social class was found to be a greater determinant of response than was what is referred to as 'media quality'.¹ High social class subjects perceived the intellectual

as more of a book-worm than an advisor, more introverted than extroverted, more the academic or professional than the highly paid leader. Quality of media involvement was not as important a determinant here as it was with evaluative, attitudinal items. Though everyone credited the intellectual with motivation to work for the societal good, the higher status believed this to a greater extent than the lower class respondents, for whom this goal was to be mistrusted. The latter group believed that intellectuals had to be out for their own self-improvement like everyone else. Everyone credited the intellectual with high education, but it was a minority of high status respondents who admitted that this learning could be achieved through self-education rather than formal schooling. To the lower class citizen, less educated himself, there seemed to be a myth about the power and value of a great amount of formal education--it lent an authority to anyone called an intellectual.

Variables which were designed to reflect attitudes produced less clearcut results, for most of the respondents seemed ambivalent about the so-called intellectual. To the middle class person of relatively secure status and high education, the intellectual was better understood but less to be trusted than he appeared to the lower class respondent. The higher status group was accordingly more willing to allow intellectuals to criticize the society, provided their criticism was constructive and concrete. The lower class person was unsure if this was the privilege of men of ideas more than ordinary citizens. Yet, the upper class group seemed to be much more restrictive of one type of intellectuals: teachers. They permitted only the morally and politically upright and non-radical to teach, and were severely against athiest- or communist-types in control of classrooms. The lower status

respondents felt that whoever was qualified to enter the classroom should be allowed to teach, regardless of moral or political considerations.

Again the lower status group seems to attribute an aura of omniscience to the academic intellectual, which the upper status group does not do.

Status tendencies were reinforced in many variables with exposure to the mass media. The high status persons who are exposed to the high quality levels of media are the most understanding of intellectual functions and positions, but they also appear to be among the most critical of intellectual role-performances. That is, the closer respondents are to the in-group of this social type, to the highly educated, avant garde sphere themselves, the easier it is for them to describe intellectual characteristics, employments and goals. Yet, they judge certain intellectual-types, such as the teacher, more harshly. It is as if they understood the man of knowledge just well enough that they knew he had weaknesses like any other human, and they were now afraid he would be weak more often than he would be strong. Yet, at the other extreme, the lowest status respondents who are exposed to low quality-levels of the mass media were simply stereotypic in their views of intellectuals. They were least inclined to restrict a teacher from the classroom for reasons of extremism, which may have several underlying reasons. We cannot know if the higher status respondents exhibited over-concern because of the local situation involving the suspension of an Edmonton district teacher, or whether they are less inclined than the lower status respondents to think that anyone who is a teacher should play that role without question. The intellectual is considered a "brain" and a leader, yet another question found that the lower class do not consider intellectuals to have any more right to criticize society

than they have. The lower status group are more willing to use negative phrases, to describe the man of ideas as an absent-minded, impractical fogey, or as a treacherous 'mad genius', and moreover, a snob. These people are not as deferential as the middle class, who are more aware of the need for intellectuals to change the society, to criticize, provided they do these things with honor and no treachery, which is always a possibility for all but the highest status respondents. The lower status respondents do not know the man of knowledge, they are either in complete awe of him, or are sure he is just another 'bigwig' leading us to ruin. To the respondents most exposed to high quality media, and who are high in social status, the intellectual is a complex human being with varied roles and goals, and to whom respect is accorded because of his difficult, creative task, the pursuit of new knowledge.

The interesting cases were the status-inconsistent respondents: the high status respondents exposed to low quality-levels of mass media, and the low status subjects who are exposed to high quality-levels of media. In both cases, the quality-level of media exposure seemed to make their views more extreme than respondents at the appropriate status-levels. The high status respondents exposed to low quality media were more ambivalent, more suspicious of the intellectual-expert, yet more willing to grant him rights and functions. The low status respondents exposed to high quality-levels of the media seemed more sensitive to the intellectual than the higher status group with high quality--as though they had over-learned the messages of high culture.

The concept of reference group identification seems to underlie the attitudes of the status-inconsistent respondents.² These persons live between the social worlds of the lower class and the upper-middle

class, and their media interests are inconsistent with their statuses. For example, the high status group with exposure to low quality media answered questions about the intellectual in a way more befitting a low status-low media respondent than one at their social position, betraying a low status identification and possible reference group.

We conclude from this study of Edmontonians from social worlds at opposite ends of the economic scale that people from different social worlds do indeed have different conceptions of 'the intellectual' social type. The inter-relationship is complex, however. The higher the status of the respondents, and thence the closer to the intellectual world of avant garde culture and education, the more explicit and academic will be the view of the role of the intellectual. Yet with the clearer conceptions, comes a clearer and less idealized feeling toward the intellectual. He is a human being, and to citizens somewhat familiar with him, he has failings they cannot forgive and forget, because with his greater knowledge he should be able to overcome human frailty. The lower the respondents' social status, the more stereotyped is the view of the intellectual, both positively in idealization of the genius-advisor, and negatively in condemnation of the publicity-seeking egghead-con-man. The further a person is from the intellectual world, the more vague are his referents for role-characteristics, and the more vivid his attitude stereotype.

Implications

The findings of this study have implications for sociological theory, for the study of the mass media, and for the status of the so-called intellectual social type. We shall consider those three areas separately.

Theoretical Implications

It is not enough merely to assert that the findings have borne out the basic argument of the sociology of knowledge, that there is a relation between the social structure and categories of thought. We have learned that the extent of categorization itself, the ability to express a verbal image of a mental construct may be related to social position. It seems apparent from the remarks made late in Chapter VI about the eleven respondents with a large number of 'don't know' responses, that they are a group to which the study of 'the intellectual' is meaningless and irrelevant. One might infer, then, that there is a point below which respondents will not find a particular concept appropriate to their cognitive structure. Whether this is related to intelligence, to years and type of education, to the proximity of the social type under study to their own social world, is not known at this stage. Further conceptualization is necessary with regard to the 'frame of reference' or 'cognitive structure' or 'category of thought' which makes a perceived phenomenon into an image retained and developed in the mind.

The general importance of education to the perception and suitability of social types is also a moot point. Are the sources of the images concepts acquired formally through the acquisition of knowledge in school, or are they acquired less formally in the course of social relationships and exposure to the mass media? It is possible that the poorly educated respondents are handicapped in learning lessons of social typing from either their social relations or their exposure to the mass media, because they lack education sufficient for such retention of concepts. They may be a "cognitively deprived" strata of society, as against the "cognitively enriched" people who were educated

well enough to be able to continue learning throughout informal experiences, socially and as media-spectators. This research seems to have scratched the surface of a social psychological phenomenon of potential complexity. Is social typing a learned ability rather than automatic with contact with in-group types?

• Implications for Mass Media Study

While exposure to great amounts of some of the mass media seems to be directly related to social status and economic affluence (for instance, purchase of magazines and books), it is not necessarily related to the quality of that media exposure. As Wilensky has shown,³ there are many people highly exposed to the lowest quality levels, as many again exposed highly to middle levels, and a few highly exposed to high quality. There are similar variations in amount of exposure and mixtures of levels of media quality. This research has found that, by and large, social class varies directly with quality of media to which respondents exposed themselves. Are the kinds of media and the kinds of offerings which are available related to the socio-cultural worlds of the various social classes? This argument has not been sufficiently bolstered by data in this or other studies, for one would require evidence that certain media consistently offered messages of particular types, and that these messages matched the values and normative concepts of particular socio-economic groups.

This study has shown that the middle quality level has captured the great bulk of our respondents' attention in their selection of media content. While we assigned quality-points to media items, these were all conditional on the media offerings available to Edmontonians in 1964-65. It has seemed in this analysis, that the quality of

exposure to the mass media can tell us more about the attitudes held by respondents than can social class alone. We appear to have the basis to urge researchers to give greater attention to media quality as an independent variable in some research studies. This project has argued that there are items about respondents' social worlds only available from research knowledge of their involvements with the mass media. The implications of this and the findings of our study suggest the need for conceptual clarification of the relationship between media selections and education, income and occupation, and between media selections and image-formation.

The Status of the Intellectual in Society

The late American poet Randall Jarrell had an academic character in his only novel who "had never been what intellectuals consider an intellectual, but other people had thought him one, and he had had to suffer the consequences of their mistake".⁴ An implication of the present project might be the constraint felt by the intellectuals who are considered exalted men of knowledge working for the societal good, by members of the non-intellectual public. How much does the image of a social type effect the self-concepts of those who are considered to belong to that type? The research noted that the small number of professors interviewed expected that the public's image of them was negative, stereotyped in a belittling way. To what extent would this opinion be embittering of the person labelled as intellectual? Is there a selective perception of consequent interchanges between himself and citizens, to bolster his negative idea of the public's opinion? How important is it to intellectuals that their image is ambivalent? Whereas Znaniecki believed that there is a social circle to whom any social role

is responsible, how much responsibility does the man of knowledge feel to the non-intellectual citizen? Is his reference group other intellectuals and their economic supporters, or does he have a general service ethic operating?

On the other side of the coin, how much consideration do people in the mass media industry have for the potential power of the social types they foster in their media offerings? If magazines and television are to portray heroes and villains in occupational roles, they should be aware of their potential effects. Research summarized in Chapter II indicates that occupational types are taking on so many shorthand characteristics that they themselves are becoming social types. The 'scientist' is a label for a whole syndrome of characteristics, as is the 'intellectual', and great care must be taken not to reify myth when utilizing occupational characters in stories.

The onus should not be completely turned away from the citizens who are themselves labelled as intellectuals. For these people must realize that the Edmonton public is not nearly as anti-intellectual as they imagine--most people seem to be politely waiting for 'intellectuals' to prove themselves. The academics, the scientists, the professionals who are considered by their occupations to be intellectuals should consider that their own behaviors could add to or detract from negative stereotypes. If they utilize a vocabulary in conversation with some layman of working-class status which is more appropriate in the seminar room, they can only expect to receive a rebuff of polite disrespect. If they proclaim political, religious or sexual beliefs in a 'shock tactic' way, they will not only be shunned, but their very jobs may disappear. Fighting the narrow morality of the middle class may have to be a subtle

and long war, for the intellectual will not gain prestige by being branded an outsider and an enemy. If his intellect is as great as his thirst for knowledge, he should be able carefully to persuade the public that he is neither evil nor immature, neither impractical nor treacherous. As the entente increases between the man of knowledge and the non-intellectual, mutually increased tolerance should be able to let them work for each other's goals as well as those things they each value separately.

Suggestions for Future Research

Some of the suggestions for further research derive from the findings, others from the implications which have been discussed. Some have conceptual relevance, others are purely methodological.

Problems that need to be researched range from the self-image of the so-called intellectual in the light of the findings of this project, to the further investigation of ambivalent attitudes toward men of knowledge. For example, as we have suggested above, there are implications for the study of the constraints felt by men of knowledge who perceive correctly or in stereotype, the citizen's images of their roles and relationships. Does the proclaimed intellectual feel himself more secure in the light of public opinion than a person who would hesitate to call himself an intellectual? Further study might uncover the sources of feedback for intellectual views on their status in the public eye.

Secondly, the research has shown that anti-intellectualism is a difficult concept to measure, and a great deal of work needs to be done to find research techniques which further uncover the extent of ambivalence and hostility which has been indicated. Earlier research into American

attitudes has revealed the latent hostilities and contradictions felt toward men of science and of intellect. Now Canadian attitudes need to be studied. The techniques known to attitude studies, such as the semantic differential and the thematic apperception test, might be used.

Concepts like 'intellectual', 'brain', 'egghead', 'scholar', 'expert', could be studied and compared for their cognitive and attitudinal differences. Conceptually it would be an addition to the study of social types to clarify what synonyms the public uses, and what are the referents of the words we consider synonyms. The labels should be investigated from the point of view of their definitions and distinctions from each other and from the image of the 'intellectual'. In such a study, the respondents would have to be told that they were assisting in the understanding of social meanings for various types. Thus, some labels of opposite types, and of neutral ones should be included, interspersed with questions about intellectual-types.

Since Canadian studies of social types are in their infancy, we might advocate the general study of the labels which are used, in much the way that Klapp and Strong have studied social typing.⁵

We have found that the controversy over the dismissal of a teacher increased interest and response during the present research. A future research project could be prepared in advance on the image of the intellectual, prefaced with an introductory letter linking it to a specific 'town' v. 'gown' conflict. At the time of such a civic dispute, in whatever center, the questionnaire could be mailed to a large random sample of ordinary citizens. It is suggested that the only time when a questionnaire will produce either a large return of the instrument, or a large number of replies to specific questions, would be when the civic

attention has been turned toward the intellectual community. At other times, the interview method can guarantee a higher rate of response.

Another area for future research investigation is into the content of Canadian mass media for images and stereotypes of such social types as the intellectual. Canadian television hero-types, fool-types and villains could be analyzed for their occupational and role images of scientists, professors and the generalized intellectual. A study of the role of men of ideas needs to be carried out in mass fiction published in Canada, to see the images of contemporary national writers. The study of mass culture in Canada, in terms of the levels of quality available on the media, could well be combined with the study of social types indigenous to Canada. After all, Wayne and Schuster's skits of Professor Weingartner's hilarious laboratory interviews are as old as television in Canada, and have entered our humor as stock situations.

In conclusion, the study of the intellectual as a social type in Canada, is productive for both understanding the Canadian social milieu, and for the field of sociology. We have found considerable politeness expressed about the role and status of the so-called intellectual in Canada, with ambivalence and hostility further below the surface than the American research on similar types appears to show. We have also bolstered the basis of the sociology of knowledge, by finding that indeed, persons of different social worlds have different cognitive structures for such a type as 'the intellectual'.

FOOTNOTES CHAPTER VII

1. 'Media quality' was introduced in Chapters II and IV, as the idea that there are levels of content in the mass media, as well as variations in type. For example, from the complexity of its content, we would argue that Festival is a higher quality level of television program than is Don Messer's Jubilee. Therefore, we tallied not only the number of items respondents were exposed to, to measure media exposure, but also the quality point-level assigned to each item on a five-point scale, to measure media quality.
2. Tamotsu Shibutani, "Reference Groups and Social Control", in Arnold M. Rose, editor, Human Behavior and Social Processes (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1962), pp. 128-147. Reference groups may be aspirant for the low status people exposed to high quality media items, as they attempt to move out of their lower, into a clearly middle-class status-level. By the same token, downward mobility may be part of the reference scheme of the other group, high status respondents exposed to low quality media items; but numbers are too few to argue this point strongly. Cf. Footnote 65, Chapter II.
3. Harold Wilensky, "Mass Society and Mass Culture" American Sociological Review, XLX, No. 2 (April, 1964), pp. 173-197. He studied males whose exposure to television could be considered as lowbrow and middlebrow in quality level.
4. Randall Jarrell's quotation, from Pictures from an Institution, p. 110, is used by Lewis Coser in Men of Ideas (New York: The Free Press, 1965), p. 276.
5. Orrin E. Klapp, Heroes, Villains and Fools (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., A Spectrum Book, 1962); Samuel M. Strong, "Social Types in a Minority Group: Formulation of a Method", AJS, XLVIII, (March, 1943), pp. 563-573. Both are referred to in greater detail in Chapters I and II. In each case, the researcher went to his respondents to find a list of the social type labels indigenous to the strata.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Albee, Edward. Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?. New York: Atheneum, 1962.
- Allport, Gordon W. The Nature of Prejudice. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co. Inc., 1954.
- Aron, Raymond. The Opium of the Intellectuals. New York: Doubleday and Co. Inc., 1957.
- Baritz, Loren. The Servants of Power. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.
- Barzun, Jacques. God's Country and Mine. Boston: Little, Brown, 1957.
- Barzun, Jacques. The House of Intellect. New York: Harper, 1959.
- Bellow, Saul. Hertzog. New York: Viking, 1964.
- Benda, Julian. The Great Betrayal. Translated by R. Aldridge. London: Routledge, 1928.
- Bendix, R. and Lipset, S.M. (eds.). Class, Status, and Power. Revised Edition, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1966.
- Blalock, Hubert M. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1960.
- Blishen, Bernard R., et. al. Canadian Society. Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Ltd., 1961.
- Boulding, Kenneth E. The Image: Knowledge in Life and Society. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1956.
- Bowman, Claude C. The College Professor in America. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1938.
- Census of Canada, 1961 Population and housing characteristics by census tracts: Edmonton. Bulletin CT-21. Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1961.
- Centers, Richard. The Psychology of Social Classes. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1949.
- Clark, Gerald. Canada--The Uneasy Neighbor. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1965.

- Colby, Ninetta (ed.). American Culture in the Sixties. New York: H.W. Wilson, 1964.
- Coser, Lewis A. Men of Ideas: A Sociologist's View. New York: The Free Press, 1965.
- Durkheim, Emile. The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life. New York: Collier Books, 1961.
- Gordon, Milton. Social Class in American Sociology. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co. Ltd., 1958.
- Gurko, Leo. Heroes, Highbrows and the Popular Mind. A Charter Book. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1962.
- Hoffer, Eric. The Ordeal of Change. Perennial Library. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.
- Hofstadter, Richard. Anti-Intellectualism in American Life. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.
- Horowitz, Irving Louis. Philosophy, Science and the Sociology of Knowledge. Springfield, Illinois: C.C. Thomas, 1961.
- de Huszan, George B. (ed.). The Intellectuals. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1960.
- Irving, John A. The Social Credit Movement in Alberta. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959.
- Irving, John A. Mass Media in Canada. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1962.
- Jacobs, Norman (ed.). Culture for the Millions?. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.
- Kaplan, Abraham. The Conduct of Inquiry. San Francisco: The Chandler Publishing Co., 1964.
- Kaplan, Norman (ed.). Science and Society. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1965.
- Klapp, Orrin E. Heroes, Villains and Fools. A Spectrum Book. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962.
- Lane, R.E., and Sears, P.O. Public Opinion. Foundations of Modern Political Science Series. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.
- Lasch, Christopher. The New Radicalism in America (1889-1963); The Intellectual as a Social Type. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965.
- Lasswell, Thomas E. Class and Stratum. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1965.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F., and Thielens, Wagner, Jr. The Academic Mind. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. Political Man. Anchor Books. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1960.

Lowenthal, Leo. Literature, Popular Culture and Society. A Spectrum Book. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.

Lynes, Russell. The Taste-Makers. New York: Harper and Bros., 1954 edition.

Macdonald, Dwight. Against the American Grain. New York: Random House, Inc., 1962.

McLuhan, Marshall. Understanding Media. Signet Books. Toronto: New American Library, 1966.

Macpherson, C.B. Democracy in Alberta. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1953.

Mannheim, Karl. Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge. New York: Oxford University Press, 1952.

Mannheim, Karl. Ideology and Utopia. A Harvest Book. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1959.

Mannheim, Karl. Essays on the Sociology of Culture. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1962.

Martindale, Don. Community, Character and Civilization. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1963.

Marx, Karl. A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1904.

Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Revised and Enlarged Edition. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957.

Molnar, Thomas. The Decline of the Intellectual. Meridian Books. Cleveland: The World Publishing Co., 1961.

Newcomb, T.M. and Hartley, E.L. (eds.). Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1947.

Osgood, Charles E. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Partisan Review, (eds.). America and the Intellectuals. A Symposium titled: "Our Country and Our Culture", New York, 1953.

Porter, John. The Vertical Mosaic. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.

- Richardson, S.A., Dohrenwend, B.S., and Klein, D. Interviewing: Its Forms and Functions. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965.
- Rose, Arnold M. (ed.). Human Behavior and Social Processes. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1962.
- Rosenberg, Bernard, and White, David M. (eds.). Mass Culture. The Falcon's Wing Press. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957.
- Schram, Wilbur. Mass Communications. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1960.
- Selltiz, Claire, et. al. Research Methods in Social Relations. Revised One-Volume Edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Sherif, M., and Cantril, H. The Psychology of Ego-Involvements. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1947.
- Shostak, Arthur B., and Gomberg, William. Blue-Collar World: Studies of the American Workers. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.
- Sorokin, Pitirim. Social and Cultural Dynamics. New York: American Book Company, 1941.
- Stark, Werner. The Sociology of Knowledge. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958.
- Taylor, Stanley. Conceptions of Institutions and the Theory of Knowledge. New York: Bookman Associates, 1956.
- Watson, Goodwin. Social Psychology: Issues and Insights. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1966.
- Webster's Third New International Dictionary. Unabridged. Springfield: G. and C. Merriam Co., 1967.
- Wilson, Logan. The Academic Man: A Study in the Sociology of a Profession. New York: Oxford University Press, 1942.
- Wolfe, Thomas. Look Homeward Angel. New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1929.
- Znaniecki, Florian. The Social Role of the Man of Knowledge. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.

ARTICLES

- Beardslee, David C., and O'Dowd, Donald D. "The College-Student Image of the Scientist." The Sociology of Science. Edited by Bernard Barber and Walter Kirsch. New York: The Free Press, 1962.
- Berger, Bennett M. "Sociology and the Intellectuals: An Analysis of a Stereotype." Antioch Review. XVII (1957), 275-290.
- Blishen, Bernard R. "A Socio-Economic Index for Occupations in Canada." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, IV, No. 1 (February, 1967), 42.
- Blum, Alan F. "Lower-Class Negro Television Spectators: The Concepts of Pseudo-Jovial Scepticism." Blue-Collar World. Edited by Arthur B. Shostak and William Gomberg. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.
- Bogart, Leo. "The Mass Media and the Blue-Collar Worker." Blue-Collar World.
- Boys, Richard C. "The American College in Fiction." College English, VII (April, 1946), 379-387.
- Cannell, Charles, and Axelrod, Morris. "The Respondent Reports on the Interview." American Journal of Sociology, LXII (1956), 177-181.
- Curti, Merle. "Intellectuals and Other People." American Historical Review, LX, No. 2 (January, 1955), 259-282.
- Demos, George D., and Belok, Michael V. "The Professorial Image." Vocational Guidance Quarterly, XII, No. 1 (Autumn, 1963), 46-49.
- Duncan, Otis D., and Duncan, Beverly. "Residential Distribution and Occupational Stratification." Studies in Human Ecology. Edited by George Theodorson. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1961.
- Dunham, Barrows. "Thinkers and Treasurers." Monthly Review, Vol. 7, No. 8 (December, 1955) 324-326.
- Endleman, Robert. "Moral Perspectives of Blue-Collar Workers." Blue-Collar World.
- Feuer, Lewis. "The Elite of the Alienated." New York Times Magazine, (March 26, 1967).
- Gordon, Milton. "Social Class and American Intellectuals." American Association of University Professors Bulletin, (Winter, 1954-1955), 517-528.

- Haag, Ernest van den. "A Dissent from the Consensual Society." Culture for the Millions?. Edited by Norman Jacobs. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.
- Hallman, Eugene. "Television." Mass Media in Canada. Edited by John A. Irving. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1962.
- Handlin, Oscar. "Comments on Mass and Popular Culture." Culture for the Millions?.
- Hatt, Paul K. "Occupations and Social Stratification." Occupations and Social Status. Edited by A. Reiss. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1961.
- Hazard, Patrick. "A General Theory of Mass Culture." Culture for the Millions?.
- Hirsch, Walter. "The Image of the Scientist in Science Fiction: A Content Analysis." The Sociology of Science.
- Howe, Irving. "This Age of Conformity." Partisan Review, XXI (January-February, 1954), 7 - 33.
- Koestler, Arthur. "The Intelligentsia". Partisan Review, XI (Summer, 1944), 265-277.
- Krohn, Roger G. "The Institutional Location of the Scientist and his Scientific Values." IRE Transactions of the Professional Group on Engineering Management, EM-VIII, No. 3 (September, 1961), 133-138.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F. "Mass Culture Today." Culture for the Millions?.
- Lynes, Russell. "Highbrow, Lowbrow, Middlebrow." The Taste-Makers. New York: Harper and Bros., 1954, 310-341.
- McCormack, Thelma. "Intellectuals and the Mass Media." The American Behavioral Scientist, IX (December 1965-January 1966), 31-36.
- McKenzie, R.D. "The Scope of Human Ecology." Studies in Human Ecology.
- Manheim, Ernest. "Introduction" to Karl Mannheim, Essays on the Sociology of Culture. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1962.
- Mann, Thomas. "The Artist and Society." The Creative Vision. Edited by H.M. Block and H. Salinger. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1960.
- Mann, W.E. "Sect and Cult in Western Canada." Canadian Society. Edited by Bernard R. Blishen, et. al., Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Ltd., 1961.

- Mead, Margaret, and Metraux, Rhoda. "The Image of the Scientist among High-School Students: A Pilot Study." The Sociology of Science.
- Merton, Robert K. "The Ambivalence of Scientists", Science and Society. Edited by Norman Kaplan. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1965.
- Mills, C. Wright. "Language, Logic and Culture." Power, Politics and People. New York: Ballantine Books, Inc., 1962.
- Mills, C. Wright. "The Social Role of the Intellectual." Power, Politics and People.
- Newsweek. Editors. "The Message of Marshall McLuhan." Newsweek, (March 6, 1967), 53-57.
- Nisbet, Robert A. "What is an Intellectual?" Commentary, XL (December, 1960), 93-101.
- Raymond, Bruce. "Radio." Mass Media in Canada.
- Reif, F. "The Competitive World of the Pure Scientist." The Sociology of Science.
- Rosten, Leo. "The Intellectual and the Mass Media: Some Rigorously Random Remarks." Culture for the Millions?.
- Schlesinger, Arthur, Jr. "The Highbrow in Politics." Partisan Review, XX (March-April 1953), 162-165.
- Seeman, Melvin. "Intellectual Perspective and Adjustment to Minority Status." Social Problems, III, No. 3 (January 1956), 142-153.
- Seeman, Melvin. "The Intellectual and the Language of Minorities." American Journal of Sociology, LXIV, No. 1 (July 1958), 25-35.
- Shibutani, Tamotsu. "Reference Groups and Social Control." in Human Behavior and Social Processes. Edited by Arnold M. Rose. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1962.
- Shils, Edward. "Mass Society and Its Culture." Culture for the Millions?.
- Strong, Samuel M. "Social Types in a Minority Group: Formulation of a Method." American Journal of Sociology, XLVII (March, 1943), 563-573.
- Time Essay Editors. "The Flourishing Intellectuals." Time Magazine. (May 21, 1965), 26-27.
- Warshay, Leon. "Breadth of Perspective." Human Behavior and Social Processes.

- Wilensky, Harold L. "Mass Society and Mass Culture: Interdependence and Independence?" American Sociological Review, XLX, No. 2 (April 1964), 173-197.
- Withey, Stephen B. "Public Opinion about Science and Scientists." The Sociology of Science.
- Wolff, Kurt H. "The Sociology of Knowledge and Sociological Theory." Symposium on Sociological Theory. Edited by Llewellyn Gross. Evanston: Row, Peterson and Company, 1959.

UNPUBLISHED PAPERS

- Belok, Michael V. "The College Professor in the Novel." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1958.
- Currie, Ian. "The Images of the College Professor." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of California, Berkeley, 1966.
- Krohn, Roger G. "The Scientist: The Individual and the Institution," paper delivered to the American Sociological Association, New York City, August, 1960.

APPENDIX I

CENSUS DATA ON EDMONTON AREAS

The information which is utilized here is taken from the 1961 Census of Canada Bulletin CT-21, Population and housing characteristics by census tracts: Edmonton. More limited data was available in the inter-censal publication from the 1966 Census: Bulletin Vol. 1 (1-6), "Divisions and Subdivisions: Western Provinces".

Edmonton city's population in 1961 was 281,027, and in the census metropolitan area, 337,568. By 1966 the boundaries had enlarged to include the towns of Jasper Place, Stony Plain and part of the county of Strathcona, so that the 1966 populations were 376,925 for the city and 401,299 for the metropolitan area. Thus it can be estimated that the city had probably passed the 325,000 mark by the time of data collection in 1964-65. With census tract information available for only the 1961 Census, it is not possible to give 1966 population figures for the two census tracts which were chosen for the present study. However, in 1961 the tract selected to represent the lower-socio-economic areas, called "The Flats" had a reported population of 8,265. The census tract chosen to represent the higher-socio-economic areas, called "The Heights", had a population in 1961 of 5,430. While a precise sampling proportion on the basis of three-year-old population figures was not attempted, respondents from the Flats number 36, and from the Heights 34. Total population figures, however, do not represent the adult population, which in the Flats was disproportionately higher than in the Heights--typical of a run-down area where the highest proportion of residents are males ages 55 to 64. Adults in the Flats in 1961 numbered 6,035, of whom 3,748 were men and 2,287 were

women over 20. In the Heights, adults numbered 2,750, almost equally split between 1,382 men and 1,368 women--all over age 20.

The Canadian Census has a definition of "crowding" which means a dwelling in which the number of persons exceeds the number of rooms occupied. This indicator of socio-economic status shows vast differences between the Flats and the Heights, for in the former area there were 377 crowded dwellings in 1961, but none at all in the Heights. In the Flats there were 117 lodging families in 1961, compared with 4 in the Heights. Rooms per dwelling in Edmonton totally numbered 5.0, the Flats numbered 3.6, in the Heights, 6.5. The average rent in the Flats was the same as for the "Downtown Slum" area of lowest socio-economic status: \$49., while in the Heights it was \$123. in 1961. Assuredly, these figures had changed by the 1964-65 data collection. The median value of homes was mentioned in Chapter III as \$14,692. for Edmonton in 1961, \$9,920. in the Flats and \$20,749. in the Heights. A Study conducted by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation of Edmonton in 1965, presents more recent data on home-building and ownership. The average of 283 Edmontonians who financed his home in early 1965 was "...34 years old, has two children and earns about \$5,800. a year." They paid an average of \$16,100. in early 1965 for a bungalow of 1110 square feet, but just \$15,650. for the same thing in 1964. These figures, and others reporting the average annual wages of home owners financing their purchase through the National Housing Act in 1964-65, were reported in The Edmonton Journal of Saturday, June 26, 1965, p. 45.

The Census shows that none of the Heights homes had been occupied for more than five years, and the majority were between three.

and five years old in 1961, 644 of the 1,248 dwellings. The lack of tenancy indicates that those 219 dwellings occupied less than a year were new homes of permanent residents. The Flats poses a contrast, again. The occupancy distribution is curvilinear, with 664 houses occupied for more than ten years, and 671 occupied by the resident for less than a year, the low ebb in the distribution being occupancy between 6 and 10 years. In the 1961 Census it is reported that of 1,043 occupied single dwellings, and 1,428 apartments, 1,344 were built before 1920 and only 296 since 1945, in the Flats. Surely recent occupants are made up of a large proportion of new transient tenants who will put up with small, run-down homes in a low-status area until they can afford something better, or until they leave Edmonton.

Considering the ethnic and religious backgrounds of Heights residents, four-fifths had been born in Canada, 3,304 of British Isles ethnicity. Over three thousand are reported as affiliated with the United or Anglican churches, with Roman Catholic third, then Lutheran and Judaic denominations. As Porter has stressed, the upper classes of English-speaking Canada have been noted for their links with Great Britain and the Anglican church. While one-quarter of the Flats residents are of British Isles ancestry, and half were born in Canada, over 2,100 were of Ukrainian or eastern Europe ancestry. There were 2,530 Flats residents in 1961 affiliated with the Roman Catholic church, and 1,832 with the United Church of Canada; then Greek Orthodox and Lutheran religious denominations.

The 1961 Census also gives educational data. Looking at non-school-age adults, the largest proportion not attending school in the

Heights have three to five years of high school, 37%. Nineteen percent, 734 out of 3,797, were educated beyond a year of University. In Edmonton totally, only 7% have some University training, and in the Flats only 3%. In Edmonton, the largest proportion of non-attending adults received 3 to 5 years of high school, and in the Flats, nearly 50% went only to elementary school, 3,375 adults.

The majority of Heights males earned more than \$ 6,000. In 1961, in fact 240 were reported to earn over \$ 10,000. By the time of the present survey, this number had likely doubled. In the Flats, only 71 persons earned more than \$ 6,000 in 1961, and 7 of these earned over \$ 10,000. There is a Brick and Tile factory in one corner of the Flats, and we speculate that its management accounts for the high salaries.

Turning to the occupational differences between the areas, the 1961 Census indicates that employed males in the Heights numbered 1,376, with 522 managers, 349 in professional and technical jobs. The lowest concentrations in male occupations in the Heights were 21 'primary' workers, 31 'laborers', 52 'service and recreation' workers. For the Flats, of 2,255 males: 808 were craftsmen and production workers, 509 service and recreation workers, 326 laborers; but only 137 managers, 87 professionals lived there. The lowest concentrations of Flats males were in the professional jobs and as primary workers: 87 also. The Census reports 73,541 employed males in Edmonton in 1961; of whom 21,266 are craftsmen and production workers, 10,239 are managers, and 8,668 are professional and technical workers.

Television is very popular in Western Canada, and has almost ceased to be an indicator of social class. In Edmonton, of 71,644

dwellings and apartments in 1961, 65,882 households had television sets. In the Flats, of 2,603 occupied households, about two-thirds had television sets: 1,600 exactly. Almost every Heights family had a television set: 1,203 of the 1,253 households reported them in 1961, and undoubtedly some homes had several sets. For a third of the homes, 428 Heights households, to have freezers in 1961 may be an important indicator of the Heights' wealth, since only 22% of Edmonton households had them then, and just 5% of the Flats households had home freezers.

We have documented the differences in various socio-economic indicators between the two census tracts under study, the Flats and the Heights. The purpose of this Appendix was in illustration of the argument in the thesis, that disparate 'social worlds' do indeed exist between respondents from the two residential areas.

APPENDIX II

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

- Interview No. _____ Project "INOP"
1. (A) Are you Married?

Never Married	_____	1
Now Married	_____	2
Widow(er)ed	_____	3
Divorced	_____	4
Separated	_____	5
NA	_____	X

 - (B) Sex: _____ F _____

 2. Not counting your holidays, about how many hours per day would you say you normally watch TV? (Check if respondent says he has no TV: _____) (Probe anyway)

Never watch	_____	1
1 to 2 hours a day	_____	2
3 to 5 hours a day	_____	3
6 to 8 hours a day	_____	4
10 to 14 hours a day	_____	5
1 to 2 hours a <u>week</u>	_____	6
3 to 5 hours a <u>week</u>	_____	7
Other (Specify: _____)	_____	8
Can't Estimate	_____	9
No Answer	_____	X

 3. What is (or are) your favorite TV program(s)? _____

 4. How much schooling and other formal training have you had?
 (If married, ask for spouse too) (Include technical training)

	Total Years	Grades, Diplomas or Degrees
(A) Resp.		
(B) Spouse		

 5. We would like to know something about your reading habits:
 Would you say that you usually read: (Hand Card)

(A) Newspapers	every day?
	a few days a week?
(B) Magazines	weekly?
	monthly?
(C) Books (for pleasure)	every few months?
	once or twice a year?
	never?
	no answer?

 6. Do you speak and read languages other than English?
 Yes _____ 1 No _____ 2 If so, what? _____

7. What magazines do you subscribe to, or read regularly?
That is, purchase monthly or more, or read in libraries?
8. (If respondent reads books at all) What are three or four books
you've read and enjoyed recently? And some you've disliked?

Enjoyed Disliked

Titles:

9. Do you like music? Yes_____ 1 No_____ 2 Indifferent_____ 3
10. (If yes to #9) What sort of music do you enjoy most?
(Probe for type: western, piano, opera?)
12. And we would like to know your age in years. Exact years_____
13. Would you please tell us your usual annual income to the nearest
figure on the card. (Hand card. If now married, ask for spouse's
annual income as well, if working)

	OWN INCOME	SPOUSE'S INCOME
\$ 0 to 1,499	_____ 1	_____ 1
1,500 to 2,999	_____ 2	_____ 2
3,000 to 4,499	_____ 3	_____ 3
4,500 to 5,999	_____ 4	_____ 4
6,000 to 7,499	_____ 5	_____ 5
7,500 to 8,999	_____ 6	_____ 6
9,000 to 11,499	_____ 7	_____ 7
11,500 to 12,999	_____ 8	_____ 8
13,000 and over	_____ 9	_____ 9
DNA, not working	_____ Y	_____ Y
NA	_____ X	_____ X

14. Now, I'd like to find out about your work: What exactly do you
do, as an occupation? (In some detail, get both summer and winter
jobs if different) (If married, does your spouse work? What
occupation?)

DESCRIBE EXACT OCCUPATION

COMPANY EMPLOYING

- (A) Male
(B) Female

(If retired, check here:_____ and ask resp:) What was the
occupation you retired from?

17. What clubs, organizations or associations do you belong to?
(Probe for all: Is that all the clubs..?)

Names of organizations

How long a member?

How active do you feel you are?

Very active
Fairly active
Not too active
Inactive

21. Would you mind telling me your religious preference:

United Church	_____	1
Anglican	_____	2
Roman Catholic	_____	3
Greek Catholic	_____	4
Presbyterian	_____	5
Greek Orthodox	_____	6
Lutheran	_____	7
Other	_____	8
None	_____	9
NA	_____	X

22. How active would you say you are in your church? (Hand card)

Very active (attend, also weekday groups)	_____	1
Somewhat active (attend services frequently)	_____	2
In-between (sporadic attender)	_____	3
Somewhat inactive (rare attender)	_____	4
Very inactive (never go, uninterested)	_____	5
NA	_____	X

27. Do you have a favorite radio station? Or, is there any one station you have turned on more than the others? (Hand card)

And similarly, is there any particular station that peeves you, so you never have it on?

	FAVORITE	PET PEEVE
Like any or all, no pref.	_____ 1	_____ 1
CBX or CBXA	_____ 2	_____ 2
CFRN	_____ 3	_____ 3
CHED	_____ 4	_____ 4
CHFA	_____ 5	_____ 5
CJCA	_____ 6	_____ 6
CKUA	_____ 7	_____ 7
Other (Specify: _____)	_____ 8	_____ 8
DNA, never listen	_____ Y	_____ Y
NA	_____ X	_____ X

28. Do other hobbies and activities that we have not mentioned take up a fair amount of your time? If so, which ones? (Not including holidays, housework, work, but e.g. garden, sewing)

29. When it comes to political parties, what is your preference in:

(A) Provincial (Alberta) Elections: _____ (Place No.)

(B) Federal (Canadian) Elections: _____ (Place No.)

(Hand card with)	Liberal	_____	1
	Progressive Conservative	_____	2
	Social Credit	_____	3
	N.D.P.	_____	4
	Other (Specify: _____)	_____	5
	No Preference	_____	6
	Don't know	_____	0
	DNA, Non-Canadian	_____	Y
	NA	_____	X

30. Do you think members of the Communist Party in this country should be allowed to speak on politics on TV and on radio?
(Probe why or why not?)

31. The next series of questions attempt to pin down what people have in mind when they use the label "Intellectual".
Sociologists are always trying to find out what various labels mean to people.
Tell me please, do you know anybody personally whom you really consider an intellectual? If so, what do they do?

Yes, both male and female	_____	1
No, don't know any	_____	2
Yes, male	_____	3
Yes, female	_____	4
NA	_____	X

32. What does the label "an intellectual" bring first to your mind?
What sort of person, with what characteristics?

33. If someone said to you: "John Doe is a typical intellectual"
what would you guess John Doe would be like?
(Probe idea of personality, physical description)

Personality

Physical Description:

34. I'm going to give you a list of careers. (Hand card) Can you tell me those you consider to be mostly intellectual occupations?
(if unclear, add: In which categories would you find most of the people to be intellectuals?)

Artist	_____	1	Politician	_____	8
Banker	_____	2	Professor	_____	9
Doctor	_____	3	Salesman	_____	10
Editor	_____	4	Schoolteacher	_____	11
Electrical Engineer	_____	5	Scientist	_____	12
Industrialist	_____	6	Social Worker	_____	13
Philosopher	_____	7	Writer	_____	14

35. Is there anything "special" about intellectuals' brain-power or personality make-up, or are they just like other people? (Is there a difference? If so, what?)

36. In Canada, what would you say is the typical intellectual's racial, national and class background? Are they more often from one group than another? All French-Canadian, all Jewish?

Race:

National, Ethnic:

Social Class:

37. Do you think a person has to have a particular amount of schooling to be an intellectual today? How much?

38. Are there, would you say, people we might call "real intellectuals" and others who are "phony intellectuals"? What's the difference, if any?
39. As far as you know, how are intellectuals employed in Canada? That is, in what specific fields do they earn their living? (Probe deeply)
40. Here is another list. Can you please find several statements that fit your view of what most intellectuals are.

Snobs	_____	1
Friendly to others	_____	2
Productive	_____	3
Lazy spongers	_____	4
Alert	_____	5
Absent-minded	_____	6
Dangerous to public welfare	_____	7
Serving public welfare	_____	8
Crafty, manipulating shysters	_____	9
Impractical dreamers	_____	10
Insufferable 'brains'	_____	11
Wise, humble teachers	_____	12
Smart-alec 'egg-heads'	_____	13
'Mad genius' type	_____	14
'Hard-struggling dullard' type	_____	15
Normal if you know them	_____	16
Slightly queer by any standards	_____	17
Other: _____	_____	18

41. What sorts of things would you say intellectuals enjoy doing for fun?
- (A) Recreation
- (B) Community activities
42. What sorts of neighborhood and community activities do you think intellectuals should take part in? (Contribution?)
43. What would you guess are the political preferences of most Canadian intellectuals--what parties would they support?
44. Are all intellectuals atheists? (Not believing in a god or church)
45. How do you feel about the statement that "It is the job of professors, writers and other intellectuals to comment on and criticize our society."?
46. What would you say are some of the bad things and the good things about Canadian intellectuals today?
- (A) Bad
- (B) Good

47. How much money would you say the typical Canadian intellectual makes each year? (Tell hesitant resps. to guess at a range of income).
48. How do you feel toward intellectuals generally? What sorts do you respect, what sorts do you disrespect?
49. What are most intellectuals working toward, in your opinion? (E.g. Money? Fame? Knowledge? Humanity's future?)
50. What did you think of the university professors speaking at Edmonton City Council after the 1963 Mayoralty Election? (Indicate here if resp. is unfamiliar with events:_____)
51. What did you think of the series of demonstrations downtown that followed? (Indicate here if resp. unfamiliar:_____)
52. Should some people be prevented from:
- (A) Expressing their opinions in public meetings? If so, who?
- (B) From marching, picketing and demonstrating? If so, who?
- (C) From teaching in our schools and universities? If so, who?
53. Suppose a billionaire left five million dollars to each of the Edmonton City, the Alberta and the Canadian governments. Suppose his will says the money is to be spent in some way useful to the whole public.
- (A) How would you suggest it be spent?
- (B) Which of these ways would you most agree with, and which least agree with: (Symbolize "m", "l")
- | | | |
|---|-------|---|
| Parks, beautification, conservation | _____ | 1 |
| Industrial or agricultural development | _____ | 2 |
| Enlarged welfare program | _____ | 3 |
| Civil and national defence | _____ | 4 |
| The arts: museums, symphonies etc. | _____ | 5 |
| Scientific research (Phys. & Biol.) | _____ | 6 |
| Research into Personal, Social Problems | _____ | 7 |
| Grants to universities, tech. schools | _____ | 8 |
54. Who are some well-known people that you think of as intellectuals? (i.e. famous names, historical or current)
55. Finally, it has been said that most intellectuals are lonely people. Do you think so? Why or why not?
56. Do you have any suggestions we might use in our study?

THANK RESPONDENT FOR HIS OR HER TIME AND ASSISTANCE

VARIATIONS AND ADDITIONS FOR ACADEMIC SAMPLE

14. Proportionately, how much of your job is spent:
 - (1) Teaching, grading exams, etc
 - (2) At research (and writing) (A) Your own
(B) Group projects
 - (3) At departmental administration (committees etc.)
 - (4) Consulting in your field
 - (5) Other:
15. (B) Why do you pursue an academic career? What is your occupational goal?
28. What is your favorite form of relaxation?
33. If a manual worker said to you: "John Doe is a typical intellectual", what would you guess John Doe would be like to him?
34. (A) How widely would you apply the label 'intellectual' in Canada--only to academics, or to who else?
34. (B) What areas of academic life do you consider most likely filled with 'intellectuals' and what areas are most lacking in them?
35. What makes an intellectual? Brain-power, personality make-up, educational opportunities?
44. What proportion of intellectuals would you think the public might call 'atheists'?
48. (B) How do you think the local community feels towards intellectuals?
(C) How do you think politicians feel?
51. (B) Was there any marked effect on the public's image of the university, in your opinion?
57. Do you consider yourself an Intellectual?
Do you think you are considered one by
 - (A) your neighbors
 - (B) your colleagues

APPENDIX III

INSTRUCTIONS FOR CULTURE JUDGES

Each judge was given the following introductory statement to read before he or she started to categorize items into appropriate ranks.

"TASTE" OR "CULTURAL PARTICIPATION"

"In the past, before the age of machines, there seemed to be two extremes in the cultural life of a people: the leaders and aristocrats had time to take part in and appreciate 'serious' art, literature and music. The common people had a 'folk art' of their own, with ballads, dances and entertainments of an entirely different sort than that of 'aristocrats'.

"Today, with the mass media, such as television, magazines, radio, newspapers and so on, the entire population has the opportunity to be exposed to all levels and types of entertainment.

In spite of this, tastes are very different. Some people claim that there is now a three-part division, three culture-types: a High, Middle, and Low type of culture. We wonder if this is so, if most people would recognize these divisions; thus, it is of interest to try to put the pieces, the culture indicators, into what might be considered the 'appropriate' slots.

"HIGH CULTURE is the type of entertainment indulged in by 'serious' intellectuals. It demands that the spectator think about and respond to the particular idea, and so strikes some people as abstract, 'beyond them', but of undoubted 'top quality'. The art aims at communication of deeply meaningful ideas and feelings. It is the real

avant-garde, and doesn't have to pretend to be.

"MIDDLE CULTURE is the outgrowth of both High and Low Culture, and retains features of both--the built-in reaction, the formulized presentation, the popularity standard, yet the trappings of High Culture. It is imitative, pretends to respect the communication standards of High Culture, yet somehow waters them down for speedy consumption. Middle Culture is enjoyed by people on the rise, whose tastes are influenced by the latest fashion. It predigests what is difficult in High Culture art, and presents it effortless to spectators.

"LOW (OR MASS) CULTURE grew out of the folk arts of past centuries. It is scorned by appreciators of Middle Culture, and sometimes enjoyed by appreciators of High Culture who like 'genuine folk art'. The message is always visible, loud and clear. As in the more sophisticated Middle Culture art product, the formula dominates, and a 'sure thing' is repeated in countless ways. Emotion becomes sentimentalism, since the appropriate reaction must be extremely obvious to spectators who want immediate pleasure or grief, who don't want to puzzle out the meaning of whatever it is that is 'entertaining' them.

INSTRUCTIONS

"When you think the differences are clear to you, please take the stack of Indicator Cards and sort them. Place the card on the appropriate Culture pile: "High", "Middle", "Low". Judge according to where you think most people would place these Indicators.

"If you are not familiar at all with any items, place those cards on the "Don't Know" card pile. If you think an item cannot be applied to only one category, if it is appreciated universally, place

it in the "ALL" card pile. When you have finished, check through each pile in case you want to change any which should be in different categories.

"At this time, please sort out into special piles the cards in each of the High, Middle and Low sections which you think are Excellent indicators of that Culture Type. Also set aside those which you suggest are poor indicators, and should be discarded.

"Work quickly and with concentration, trying not to think very long on each item: first thoughts are best."

APPENDIX IV

TABLES FOR CHAPTER IV

The enclosed tables are designed to show the 'fit' between the items discussed in Chapter IV, and the ranked sums of the score totals. In this way, the precise contribution of each item can be known.

Item-to-score tables show the components of the Social Class Score and of the Media Exposure Score. The Media Quality Score is in the form of medians, not total sums. Included are the tables which show the 'fit' between quality items and score-medians.

TABLE IV - 1
FAMILY INCOME IN FIFTEEN-HUNDRED-DOLLAR CATEGORIES

Income	Number	(%)
\$ 0. to 1,499.	4	(6)
1,500. to 2,999.	5	(7)
3,000. to 4,499.	11	(16)
4,500. to 5,999.	11	(16)
6,000. to 7,499.	11	(16)
7,500. to 8,999.	6	(8)
9,000. to 11,499.	2	(3)
11,500. to 12,999.	4	(6)
13,000. and over	14	(20)
No answer given*	2	(3)
Total	70	(100)

*Later placed in \$0. to 5,999. grouping because other social class traits are Low (SC scores: 1).

TABLE IV - 2
SOCIAL CLASS SCORE BY FAMILY INCOME (GROUPED)

Social Class Score	Annual Family Income									
	\$0. to \$4,499.		\$4,500. to \$5,999.		\$6,000. to \$12,999.		\$13,000. & Over		Totals	
	(%)*		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)	
Low	21	(96)	6	(55)	1	(4)	0	(0)	28	(40)
Middle	1	(4)	5	(46)	10	(44)	0	(0)	16	(23)
High	0	(0)	0	(0)	12	(52)	14	(100)	26	(37)
Totals	22		11		23		14		70	

$$\chi^2 = 70.991 \quad (df=6) \quad P .001$$

*Percentages have been rounded, and may not equal 100%.

TABLE IV - 3

SOCIAL CLASS SCORE BY RESPONDENT'S YEARS OF EDUCATION

Social Class Score	Years of Education			Totals
	Under 9 Years	9 to 12 Years	13 Years & over	
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Low	12 (86)	15 (45)	1 (4)	28 (40)
Middle	1 (7)	10 (30)	5 (22)	16 (23)
High	1 (7)	8 (24)	17 (74)	26 (37)
Totals	14	33	23	70
$\chi^2 = 29.918$ (df=4) P .001				

TABLE IV - 4

SOCIAL CLASS SCORE BY SPOUSE'S YEARS OF EDUCATION

Social Class Score	Years of Education			Totals*
	Under 9 Years	9 to 12 Years	13 Years & over	
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Low	9 (100)	16 (44)	1 (5)	26 (40)
Middle	0 (0)	12 (33)	3 (15)	15 (23)
High	0 (0)	8 (22)	16 (80)	24 (37)
Totals	9	36	20	65
$\chi^2 = 34.168$ (df=4) P .001				

*Omits 5 who have no spouse.

SOCIAL CLASS SCORE BY OCCUPATION CATEGORIES OF BREADWINNER
(MALE OR FEMALE)

Social Class Score	Occupation Categories						Totals	
	Blue Collar		White Collar		Manager- Professional			
		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)
Low	26	(87)	2	(15)	0	(0)	28	(40)
Middle	4	(13)	10	(77)	2	(7)	16	(23)
High	0	(0)	1	(8)	25	(93)	26	(37)
Totals	30		13		27		70	
$\chi^2 = 86.272$ (df=4) P .001								

SOCIAL CLASS SCORE BY AREA OF RESIDENCE

Social Class Score	Area				Totals	
	"The Flats"		"The Heights"			
	(%)		(%)		(%)	
Low	28	(78)	0	(0)	28	(40)
Middle	7	(19)	9	(26)	16	(23)
High	1	(3)	25	(74)	26	(37)
Totals	36		34		70	
$\chi^2 = 50.383$ (df=2) P .001						

TABLE IV - 7

MEDIA EXPOSURE BY NUMBER OF FAVORITE TV SHOWS

Media Exposure Score	No. Favorite Shows								Totals**	
	One or Two Types of Shows*		One or Two Specific Shows		Three to Four Shows		Five or More Shows			
	(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)	
Low	7	(37)	9	(39)	5	(21)	0	(0)	21	(30)
Middle	8	(42)	7	(30)	9	(37)	0	(0)	24	(35)
High	4	(21)	7	(30)	10	(42)	3	(100)	24	(35)
Totals	19		23		24		3		69	

$$\chi^2 = 9.130 \quad (df=6) \quad P \quad .15 \quad (\text{Insignificant})$$

* i.e. General categories like "Westerns", "Sports", "Drama".

** Omits 1 who has no TV set, but sometimes watches at friends' homes.

TABLE IV - 8

MEDIA EXPOSURE BY NUMBERS OF MAGAZINES READ

Media Exposure Score	No. Magazines Read								Totals*	
	None		One to Three		Four to Six		Seven or More			
	(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)	
Low	7	(78)	12	(43)	0	(0)	0	(0)	19	(28)
Middle	2	(22)	12	(43)	9	(50)	1	(8)	24	(36)
High	0	(0)	4	(14)	9	(50)	11	(92)	24	(36)
Totals	9		28		18		12		67	

$$\chi^2 = 41.034 \quad (df=6) \quad P \quad .001$$

* Omitted are 3 who did not answer.

TABLE IV - 9

MEDIA EXPOSURE BY NUMBER OF BOOKS ENJOYED RECENTLY

Media Exposure Score	No. Books Enjoyed						Totals	
	None Given*		One or Two		Three or More			
		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)
Low	14	(61)	6	(22)	2	(10)	22	(31)
Middle	9	(39)	10	(37)	5	(25)	24	(34)
High	0	(0)	11	(41)	13	(65)	24	(34)
Totals	23		27		20		70	

$$\chi^2 = 24.430 \quad (df=4) \quad P \quad .001$$

* Includes "none", "Can't Recall", and "No Answer".

TABLE IV - 10

MEDIA EXPOSURE BY NUMBER OF KINDS OF MUSIC ENJOYED

Media Exposure Score	No. Kinds of Music				Totals	
	One or Two Kinds		Three or More Kinds			
		(%)		(%)		(%)
Low	19	(35)	3	(19)	22	(31)
Middle	21	(39)	3	(19)	24	(34)
High	14	(26)	10	(63)	24	(34)
Totals	54		16		70	

$$\chi^2 = 7.336 \quad (df=2) \quad P \quad .02$$

TABLE IV - II

MEDIA EXPOSURE BY NUMBER OF RADIO STATIONS PREFERRED

Media Exposure Score	No. Radio Stations						Totals	
	None		One		Two or More			
		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)
Low	2	(22)	17	(38)	3	(19)	22	(31)
Middle	1	(11)	18	(40)	5	(31)	24	(34)
High	6	(67)	10	(22)	8	(50)	24	(34)
Totals	9		45		16		70	
$\chi^2 = 14.766$ (df=4) P .01								

TABLE IV - 12

RANKED MEDIANS OF QUALITY-LEVEL BY MEDIA EXPOSURE SCORE

Ranked Medians	Media Exposure Score						Totals	
	Low		Middle		High			
	(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)	
Low	12	(55)	10	(42)	3	(13)	25	(36)
Middle	9	(41)	7	(29)	7	(29)	23	(33)
High	1	(5)	7	(29)	14	(58)	22	(31)
Totals	22		24		24		70	
$\chi^2 = 17.301$		(df=4)		.01	P	.001		

MEDIANS OF QUALITY SCORES BY TV QUALITY VIEWED

Median Quality Scores	Respondent Quality-levels of TV viewing								Totals	
	Low		Middle		High		Range			
	(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)	
Low	14	(74)	9	(27)	0	(0)	2	(29)	25	(36)
Middle	4	(21)	18	(53)	0	(0)	1	(14)	23	(33)
High	1	(5)	7	(21)	10	(100)	4	(57)	22	(31)
Totals	19		34		10		7		70	
$\chi^2 = 41.020$ (df=6) P .001										

TABLE IV - 14

MEDIANS OF QUALITY SCORES BY QUALITY OF MAGAZINES READ

Median Quality Scores	Respondent Quality-levels of Magazines Read								Totals	
	None		Low		Middle		High & Range*			
	(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)	
Low	6	(50)	13	(57)	5	(24)	1	(7)	25	(36)
Middle	5	(42)	7	(30)	5	(24)	6	(43)	23	(33)
High	1	(8)	3	(13)	11	(52)	7	(50)	22	(31)
Totals	12		23		21		14		70	
$\chi^2 = 17.761$ (df=6) .01 P .001										

* 6 of these are High: 2 in Middle, 4 in High Medians.

MEDIANS OF QUALITY SCORES BY QUALITY OF RADIO PREFERENCE

Median Quality Scores	No Preference		Low		Middle		High & Range		Totals	
	(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)	
Low	4	(23)	14	(58)	7	(37)	0	(0)	25	(36)
Middle	2	(12)	9	(38)	9	(47)	3	(30)	23	(33)
High	11	(65)	1	(4)	3	(16)	7	(70)	22	(31)
Totals	17		24		19		10		70	
$\chi^2 = 29.303$ (df=6) P .001										

